

THE LIBRARY

EDITED BY
JOY W. MACHLIS
U.S.A.



PRICE 7/11

LIBRARY ASSOCIATION.

THE LIBRARY ASSOCIATION was founded in 1877, and in 1898 received a Royal Charter in recognition of the value of its public work. The membership of the Association is not confined to Librarians. Its main objects are to unite all persons engaged or interested in Library Administration or in Bibliographical Research. For this purpose it has instituted classes in Librarianship and Bibliography, holds examinations in the above subjects, and issues certificates which are now recognized as essential qualifications for appointments as Library Assistants or Librarians. The annual subscription is one guinea, in return for which the Member receives the monthly organ of the Association, is entitled to the free use of the lending library maintained by the Association, and to attend its monthly and annual meetings. For membership forms apply to

MRS. REILLY,

Whitcomb House, Whitcomb Street,
Fall Mall East, S.W.

CONTENTS OF DECEMBER NUMBER, 1906.

THE PRESENT POSITION OF LONDON MUNICIPAL LIBRARIES, WITH SUGGESTIONS FOR INCREASING THEIR EFFICIENCY. By J. McKILLOP.
THE BRADFORD MECHANICS' INSTITUTE LIBRARY. By C. A. FEDDER.
ON THE GLAZING OF LIBRARIES. WITH REFERENCE TO THE CHEMICAL ACTION OF LIGHT UPON LEATHER. By A. SEYMOUR-JONES.
THOUGHTS ON THE REFERENCE DEPARTMENT. By HORACE BARLOW.
PROFESSIONAL PERIODICAL LITERATURE.
REVIEWS.
NOTES AND NEWS.
APPOINTMENTS.
LIBRARY ASSOCIATION: PROCEEDINGS AND OFFICIAL NOTICES.

ELLIS

Dealers in Old and Rare Books, Manuscripts, Prints,
and Autographs

RECENT CATALOGUES.

Catalogue (No. 112) of Rare Books, including INCUNABULA, ENGLISH BOOKS to 1640, etc.

Catalogue (No. 12) of Rare PORTRAITS.

Catalogue (Nos. VII-VIII) of Books, Autographs, and Portraits relating to MUSIC and MUSICIANS.

Catalogue of British and American BOOKPLATES from the Franks Collection. Bound in cloth, price 2s. 6d.

29, NEW BOND STREET, LONDON, W.

EGYPTIAN ANTIQUITIES

A Notable Discovery by Mr. Robert Mond

ARAMAIC PAPYRI: Discovered at Assuan

Edited by Prof. A. H. SAYCE, with the assistance of A. E. COWLEY; and with Appendices by W. SPIEGELBERG and SEYMOUR DE RICCI. Double crown folio, in portfolio. 1 Guinea net.

Contents—General and Grammatical Introductions. Appendix I.—Explanation of Egyptian Names. Appendix II.—Bibliography—Translation of the Text, with Commentary—Index of Proper Names—Glossary—Texts—Facsimiles.

A complete Catalogue of Publications will be forwarded on application.

THE DE LA MORE PRESS, ALEXANDER MORING, LTD.
33, GEORGE STREET, HANOVER SQUARE, W.

Se
No

TI
FI



wr
slig
sou
res
po

lea
luc
in
to
po
wr
ren
qu
co
Je

THE LIBRARY.

THE LIVELIHOOD OF THE PROFESSIONAL WRITER, CIRCA 1600.



PREVIOUS article in this Magazine, dealing with the question of patronage, tended to demonstrate its economic necessity, as a means of supplementing the scanty earnings of the professional writer. The following remarks are offered as a slight essay towards determining other possible sources of income open to one who should be resolved to avoid at all costs the uncomfortable position of the parasite.

Controversial Writing.—If possessed of sufficient learning and acuteness, he would probably find it most lucrative to undertake controversial work, especially in theology. Officials and clerics were fully alive to the necessity of answering some of the many polemical treatises issued by Jesuit and Puritan writers, from Louvain and elsewhere; and a fair remuneration awaited the man who could give adequate proof of his orthodox zeal, his learning, and controversial ability. Thomas Bell, a converted Jesuit, who wrote thirteen works against the Papists,

and further made himself useful by assisting to discover disguised Jesuits, received a pension of £50 a year, no mean income in those days. Nor was it only the orthodox who were prepared to pay well for a learned and forcible exposition of their views. George Wither, when he had published a little sacred poetry, told his readers, 'I have been offered a large yearly stipend, and more respective entertainments, to employ myself in setting forth heretical fancies, than I have yet probability to hope for by proposing the Truth.'¹ Learned work of a scientific nature appears to have been well rewarded by those interested.

Translation.—Translation, also, afforded employment to numerous professional writers, though for the most part it was probably hack work for the booksellers. John Wolfe alone must have provided a good deal of such employment, for he entered in the Stationers' Register no fewer than seventy-seven translations, from Latin, Italian, French, Dutch and Spanish. Information is wanting as to the payment received by the better class of translators; Philemon Holland had independent resources, and John Florio had many other ways of making an income, and probably relied little upon his translating work. The hack translator and compiler fared badly. Richard Robinson, who produced many indifferent versions of dull Latin works for various publishers, appears to have received no money payment at all. The proceeds of a certain number of copies, to be disposed of by himself to friends and patrons—eked

¹ 'Scholar's Purgatory' (c. 1624), p. 68.

out, if luck willed, by a dedication fee—formed his only remuneration.¹

Reading for the Press.—Correcting for the press also provided some employment, especially for men sufficiently educated to read proofs in foreign and dead languages. John Foxe was a press corrector for some time while abroad, and possibly also acted in the same capacity for the printer, John Day. It was reckoned among the serious expenses incurred by the printer, as compared with the mere publisher, that the former had his 'learned correctors' to maintain constantly. They seem to have been engaged permanently, or at least for long periods. They were needed to correct reprints from classical and foreign languages, and such works as were not superintended in the customary manner by the authors themselves—if considered worth much correction.

The scholar in the 'Return from Parnassus' probably represents aptly enough the contempt of the University-bred man for such technical routine occupation. 'Whatever befalls thee,' he cries, 'keepe thee from the trade of the corrector of the presse. . . . Would it not grieve any good spiritt to sit a whole moneth nitting over a lousie beggarly pamphlet . . . ?'²

Lowest forms of Writing.—Lower still, in the infernal circles in which literary sinners were condemned to toil and suffer, was the degrading employment of the news factor, the prophetic almanac

¹ See article by R. B. McKerrow, on Richard Robinson's 'Eupolemia,' in 'The Gentleman's Magazine,' April, 1906.

² Part ii, p. 82, ed. Mackay.

writer, the ballad and jig writer, and the versifier who wrote lascivious lines to suit the taste of the vicious.

To such work was the author of genuine talents occasionally forced, with greater or less reluctance, according to the standard which he had set up for himself. And he had here the mortification of finding himself elbowed by men of different calibre—mere uneducated scribblers. The perpetual gibes of men like Nash, Dekker, Hall, Hake, even of Jonson and Drayton, show that they felt keenly the competition caused by these scribblers, and felt, too, that by the public the more worthy writer was by no means always clearly distinguished from the base.

No doubt the appearance of this lowest class of writer was the direct result of the spread of elementary education and the introduction of printing. Only the very lowest, crudest forms of so-called literature could be at this time appreciated by a great part of the reading public; but for those there was a large, ready sale. This is proved by the very large numbers of 'ballets' and broadsides registered by the Stationers' Company. Certain writers, such as William Elderton, Thomas Deloney, Robert Armin, etc., 'the riffe-raffe of the scribbling rascality,' acquired a widespread popularity by their ephemeral productions; and other writers of greater capabilities, such as Breton, Dekker, Greene, Middleton, Rowlands, published some work which can only be distinguished from that of their inferiors by greater vigour of treatment. Very few, even of the best, could boast that they had never been in-

THE PROFESSIONAL WRITER. 5

duced by need to cater for unworthy tastes. Lodge could not, though he does in his 'Glaucus and Scylla' register a vow:

To write no more of that whence shame doth grow,
Or tie my pen to pennie-knaves' delight,
But live with fame, and so for fame to wright.

Nash confesses, with his usual frankness, 'Twice or thrice in a month, when *res est angusta domi* . . . I am faine to let my plow stand still in the midst of a furrow, and follow some of those new-fangled Galiardos and Signor Fantasticos, to whose amorous Villannellas and Quipasses I prostitute my pen in hope of gain. . . .'¹

Such compete with good Work.—Drayton expressly ascribes the neglect of great writers to the public taste for the lowest work, thus copiously supplied.

Base baladry is so belov'd and sought
And those brave numbers are put by for naught,
Which, rarely read, were able to awake
Bodies from graves.

. . . but I know, ensuing ages shall
Raise her again who now is in her fall
And out of dust reduce our scatter'd rhymes,
Th' rejected jewels of these slothful times.²

In the same spirit Jonson apologizes for the delay in publication of 'Neptune's Triumph' on the ground that he preferred to wait till 'the abortive and extemporal din' of balladry had subsided:

¹ 'Have with you to Saffron Waldon.' 'Works,' iii, 44.

² Drayton. 'To Master George Sandys.'

The muses then might venture undeterred,
For thy love, then, to sing, when they are heard.

It may not be true that the general public was quite unable to discern the difference between poetry and doggerel, between the racy pamphlets of Nash and Dekker, and the heavy-handed description of the latest marvel by the hack news-writer. Still, the distinction was a little blurred, and not seldom wilfully ignored. Gabriel Harvey knew, possibly, that he was deliberately unfair when he penned the following parallel; he certainly knew that many readers would accept his words:

'He (Nash) disdaineth Thomas Delone, Philip Stubbs, Robert Armin, and the common pamphleters of London, even the painfullest Chroniclers, too; because they stand in his way, hinder his scribbling traffic . . . and have not chronicled him in their catalogue of the renowned modern authors. . . . But may not Thomas Delone, Philip Stubbs, Robert Armin, and the rest of those misused persons more disdainfully disdaine him, because he is so much vainer, so little learned, so nothing eleganter than they; and they so much honester, so little obscurer, so nothing contemptibler than he?'¹

But suppose a writer unwilling to sink to the level of the 'scribbling rascality,' what other resources were open to him, with which to eke out scanty earnings and fitful bounty?

Public Appointments.—Jonson was comparatively fortunate, though he was miserably poor in later life. He had, besides the proceeds of the sale of

¹ 'Pierce's Supererogation,' 'Works,' ed. Grosart, ii, 280-1.

manuscripts, some friendly patronage; he had the post of poet laureate, worth about a hundred marks (£66 13s. 4d.), though paid with little regularity; and he held for a short time the appointment of City Chronologer, worth about £10 yearly. Middleton also held this latter post for some years. But these appear to have been the only public appointments open to literary men as such. The great majority of professional writers must have found themselves driven either to accept positions to some extent incompatible with their chosen profession, or to become, for a part at least of their time, mere hack writers. They must dull the edge of their talents by slaving for the booksellers, or, worse, prostitute them by pandering to low tastes.

University Preferments.—A young University man of talent, in need of a settled income, might perhaps naturally hope for preferment to a Fellowship. But to qualify for a Fellowship was an expensive matter, and many promising young men found it impossible to reside for a sufficient length of time. University education was, in Elizabethan days, as now, costly. It had undoubtedly become more expensive since it had grown to be a custom for the sons of rich men to spend some time at the University, as part of the training for a secular career. As to the actual cost, Gabriel Harvey boasted that his father had spent £1,000 on the education of four sons¹—a very large sum then for the moderately wealthy, impossible to a poor man. Many

¹ Harvey. 'Green's Memorial,' Sonnet XX. 'Works,' ed. Grosart, i, 250-1. It is possible that Harvey is reckoning the total cost of school and University education.

university students still eked out their scanty means, in the mediaeval fashion, by begging. In January, 1580, a 'scoller of Oxforde' was accused of wandering through the country with a fellow student, with forged licence to beg, in order 'to get moneye . . . for their better exhibition.'¹ There were, of course, many scholarships to the University from grammar schools, and sizarships for poor undergraduates. Marlowe and Spenser were in all probability indebted to such provision. The records of Beverley Corporation mention a number of exhibitions granted to grammar-school boys on their admission to the University. The sums granted vary from thirty shillings to two pounds yearly.² But, in any case, frequent references go to prove that the lot of the University scholar was hardly enviable. 'Scholars,' says Breton, are 'hardly brought up, therefore they should away with hardness the better; their allowance in college is small, therefore little meate should content them.'³ Moreover, as we shall see later on, scholarships and sizarships, like most other advantages, could hardly be obtained without influence.

Private benefactors, again, would not infrequently support promising youths at the University, as Lady Burghley supported Speght, and as Alex. Nowell supported others. But the course was long—seven years before proceeding to the M.A. degree, and it sometimes happened that length of time, and acci-

¹ 'Hist. MSS. Comm. V.' App. Part i, 579.

² A. F. Leach. 'Yorkshire Schools,' I, liii.

³ 'Will of Wit.' 'Discourse of Scholar and Soldier.' 'Works,' ed. Grosart, i.

dent, brought to an end the benefactor's generosity. No University preferment could, naturally, be looked for by one whose career had stopped short of the degree, unless indeed, once more, by the way of 'influence.'

It must be noted, further, that the holding of a Fellowship, or even mere residence after taking the M.A. degree, entailed certain obligations not very congenial to the candidate for fame and money in the field of *belles-lettres*. Every resident M.A. was required to give lectures, which practically meant, to interpret and comment upon the somewhat arid 'texts' which formed the staple of University study in Dialectic, Law, and Theology. His remuneration for this work was confined to the fees paid by undergraduates.¹

There were, further, practical reasons which made residence in the University inconvenient for the man who wished to become a professional writer. The distance of both Universities from London, the only centre of the publishing trade, was a serious bar. Nor could he hope to get work published by the University printing presses; these were practically idle. From 1522 to 1584 there was no printing done at Cambridge, and when in 1584 a press was started under the auspices of the University, it met with most determined opposition from the Stationers' Company, as an infringement of their rights. Thanks to Burghley, the University triumphed; but no great benefit resulted to the professional writer.²

¹ Bass Mullinger, 'History of the University of Cambridge,' p. 28.

² The Oxford University Press published about one hundred

John Lyly, in 1574, applied to Burleigh to use his influence to obtain for him a Fellowship;¹ but this was before the days of his authorship, which was perhaps indirectly brought about by his failure to obtain the desired preferment. Nash, on the other hand, declares that he 'might have been Fellow,' if he had chosen. No doubt we are to infer that he scorned it.² It is uncertain whether his boast was justified; he left the University before the end of his seventh year of residence,³ and, what is more, he does not appear to have been able to reckon upon the necessary influence. 'It is in my time an hard matter,' says Harrison, 'for a poore man's child to come by a Felowship. . . . Not he which best deserveth, but he that hath most friends . . . is alwaies surest to speed' (1577).⁴ Gross corruption and interference from highly placed personages for the most part decided the choice of Fellows. 'Learning nowadays gets nothing if it come empty-handed; promotion . . . is become a purchase.'

There was another determining factor to be reckoned with—one, if possible, still less favour-

and sixty works during the years 1585-1603, all but eight of these being in Latin, or theological works. The eight exceptions are nearly all occasional verses on recent public events. Two only attain to any literary rank, viz.: Breton's 'Pilgrimage to Paradise' (1592) and Davies' 'Microcosmos' (1603). Later, Cambridge published Giles Fletcher's 'Christ's Victory and Triumph' (1610) and Phineas Fletcher's 'Purple Island' (1633); but their father had held an important position in the University.

¹ 'Euphues,' ed. Arber, 1895, p. 3.

² 'Have with you.' 'Works,' v, p. 189.

³ 'Lenten Stuff.' 'Works,' v, p. 241.

⁴ 'Description of England.' New Shaks. Soc., Part i, p. 77.

able to the literary professional as known to us for the most part. During the greater part of the reigns of Elizabeth and James I, the policy of the Universities was governed by considerations theological rather than educational or scholarly.

There was great dearth of men fit for the ministry, and in consequence, the authorities imposed upon the Universities as their primary duty the training of men to enter holy orders. Every effort was made to encourage the study of divinity, and turn the Universities into feeding supplies for the Church. Fellowships were restricted to those who would 'profess the study of divinity,' and pains were taken to secure that the profession should be more than nominal.¹ The fairly liberal education which formerly preceded the study of divinity was curtailed, and sometimes even dispensed with, to the disgust of the broader-minded.² No doubt the average Englishman thoroughly approved of this view of the functions of the University.³ It was practical; and, moreover, theology was at that time a subject of great interest to most men. The policy had, however, an unfortunate effect. It fostered hypocrisy, and it lowered the educational standard, causing candidates for preferment to be selected on theological grounds rather than for their intellectual qualifications. A show of religious zeal not only added to the chances of an aspirant for honours, it even

¹ Bass Mullinger. 'Cambridge from 1535 . . .', p. 307.

² W. S(tafford). 'A Brief Conceit . . . 1581.' New Shaks. Soc., p. 25.

³ Breton, in 'Wit's Trenchmour,' 1597, represents a rustic father complaining of the neglect of his son's education in Divinity.

assisted him materially by accelerating his attainment of degrees. And on the other hand, Nash grumbles: 'If at the first peeping out of the shell a young student sets not a grave face on it, and seems not mortifiedly religious (have he never so good a witte, be hee never so fine a scholler), he is cast off and discouraged. . . . Your preferment . . . occasioneth a number of young hypocrites.'¹

Nash's view is probably biassed; but he undoubtedly represents the natural resentment felt by the unclerical writer towards an evil which really existed. It is difficult, under the circumstances, to believe that he himself was ever 'religious' enough to have stood any chance of a Fellowship!

If this theological atmosphere did not deter a man from University residence, then a further discouragement would probably confront him from college disputes. Both Oxford and Cambridge seem, during the latter part of the sixteenth century, to have been hotbeds of contentiousness. Their quarrels were notorious. The State Papers are full of records of appeals to the Crown, now from one side, now from the other, in bitter college feuds. Theological bias was one great cause, the tyranny of heads of colleges was another, and frequently the two combined. Certain changes made in internal administration had given greatly increased powers to the heads of colleges, who seem frequently to have been at open war with their respective bodies of Fellows. Thus in 1565 the head of Caius College is said to have expelled twenty Fellows, and

¹ 'Christ's Tears' (1594), 'Works,' iv, 185.

to have punished some even with beating and the stocks!¹ In 1576 the visitor of New College, Oxford, found the college distracted by such grievous factions that four ringleaders had to be ejected and others chastised.² The Fellows of Magdalene, Cambridge, petitioned the Chancellor against their President on the ground that he had 'rooted out' a Welsh lecturer simply for his nationality, and that he pastured his cows in the college grounds, as if they were his private property.³ Yet again, in 1598, we learn, the warden of Merton College, Oxford, has, after a severe tussle, got the better of his Fellows, fined and punished them, and expelled one who is said to have died 'of grief or curst heart' within five days!⁴

Such surroundings were not likely to prove congenial to men seeking leisure and peace for the work of artistic creation. The inevitable effect was to drive from the University all men of dignity, worth, and genius. John Foxe had to resign his Fellowship at Magdalen, Oxford, on account of his objection to the theological requirements exacted. Lyly, we have seen, failed to get the Fellowship he asked for; hardly a single writer of any repute kept up his connection with either University.⁵

From the practical point of view, moreover, a

¹ Bass Mullinger, 'Cambridge from 1535 . . .' p. 201.

² Coll. MSS. Hatfield, ii, p. 187.

³ Bass Mullinger, 'Cambridge from 1535 . . .' p. 287 *n*.

⁴ J. Chamberlain's 'Letters,' 8th Nov., 1598. 'Camden Soc.,' vol. 79.

⁵ An exception is Thomas Heywood, who is stated to have been a Fellow at Peterhouse.

Fellowship was of such small value that it was hardly worth the sacrifice of leisure, peace, and principle involved. Although the Universities seem, under Elizabeth, to have steadily increased in prosperity, if not in scholarship and in dignity, the value of preferments was very small, amounting to the very barest living. Fellowships at King's College, Cambridge were worth a little more than £5 13s. 4d. (= £34) yearly; at St. John's most of the Fellows received £3 5s. 4d.; at Peterhouse 2s. a week. To quote from Mr. Bass Mullinger's interesting account: 'Generally speaking, the Fellow of a college who received 1s. 6d. a week for what we should now term his "board," thought himself well off.'¹ If Nash is to be believed, Gabriel Harvey, a Fellow of Pembroke, was unable to pay his own commons, and had to be helped by the charity of the rest of the Fellows.² J. Lyly was in debt at one time for his battells, 23s. 10d.³

The heads of colleges were little better off. When, in 1561, John Pilkington announced to the Vice-Chancellor his resignation of the mastership of St. John's College, Cambridge, he stated that its yearly value was only £12.⁴ In 1591 the master of the same college, a man esteemed for his classical training, was so poor that the Dean of St. Paul's had taken charge of one of his sons, by way of charity to him.⁵ There is some justification for

¹ Bass Mullinger, *ut supra*, p. 11, 290 n.

² 'Have with you . . .' 'Works,' iii, 130-31.

³ Arber, 'Euphues,' p. 7.

⁴ Bass Mullinger, *ut supra*, p. 185 n.

⁵ 'Camden Soc.,' xxiii, p. 87. Letter of 29th April, 1591.

Nash's assertion that half-educated University men 'betake themselves to some trade of husbandry, for any maintenance they get in the way of alms at the Universitie.'¹ Even these poor endowments were threatened by the rapacity of courtiers.²

The general poverty of members of the University is strikingly illustrated by a chance remark uttered by a boasting snob in the 'Returne from Parnassus': 'I cannot come to my inn in Oxforde without a dozen congratatorie orations, made by *Genus* and *Species* and his ragged companions. I reward the poor *ergoes* most bountifullie, and send them away.'³

Tutorships.—Tutorships, it is true, provided one source of emolument for senior members of the University. But, on account of the youthful age at which undergraduates came up, tutorships involved duties very much more exacting than those which are attached to the office to-day; more arduous than those of the present master in a public school. They amounted to a fulfilment of the functions of teacher, matron, and guardian. The tutor superintended the expenses of the undergraduate, bought necessary apparel and bed-linen for him, bought his books (and sometimes was left to pay the bill!), taught him privately, and superintended his religious and moral welfare.⁴ The tutor of the Earl of Essex writes regarding the young earl's extreme necessity

¹ 'Anatomic of Absurditie.' 'Works,' i, 54-55.

² *Ibid.*, i, 52-53.

³ Part i, (c. 1600), ed. Mackay, p. 85.

⁴ Bass Mullinger, 'Cambridge in the Seventeenth Century,' p. 489.

of apparel: 'he will, if not soon supplied, be not only threadbare but ragged.'¹ As late as 1646 we find a father requiring his son's tutor to see that he has employment on Sundays and fast-days, and to take care that he reads the Scriptures morning and evening. He even has to share his room with his pupil.² One of the characters in the 'Returne from Parnassus' recalls the time when he was in Cambridge, and lay 'in a trundle bed' under his tutor.³ For all this wearisome attendance upon the youthful undergraduate, during an academic year arranged to give little more than six weeks' vacation, the remuneration was twenty shillings per annum.⁴

Clearly, no one who aspired to a career in literature could afford to take upon himself duties so exacting for a reward so inadequate. John Florio, it is true, was at one time a tutor in Oxford; but he seems to have renounced the position for the more promising occupation of private teacher of languages, with a good connection, in London. The income gained from this seems to have sufficed for him, and in the intervals of teaching he was able to write.⁵

¹ Cooper, 'Annals' (ed. 1843), p. 353. See a similar appeal for money and clothing for his pupil by the tutor of James Oxenden (c. 1630) quoted by Mr. Plomer in 'The Library,' vi (new series), p. 33.

² Bass Mullinger, *ut supra*, p. 49.

³ Ed. Mackay, p. 110.

⁴ Hubert Hall, 'Society in the Elizabethan Age,' App. i, p. 156.

⁵ The above remarks apply also, in varying degree, to travelling tutorships, which could never, however, have been more than temporary expedient.

THE PROFESSIONAL WRITER. 17

Thus we may conclude that, with preferments given almost entirely through 'influence,' or according to theological acquirements or pretensions; limited to those in Holy Orders, or proceeding to take them; and, finally, far from sufficient to maintain the holder in bare necessities; with obligations to lecture and conduct University exercises in subjects particularly unlikely to be congenial to a mind of literary and artistic bent; the only other means of earning money—tutoring—being an engrossing duty which would leave no time or energies for creative work; it is not surprising that the University should have proved the very last home for a would-be writer.

As to the openings offered by the lower teaching profession, not much can be said here. The subject of school education in the later sixteenth century is beset with many difficulties and problems as yet unsolved. It is proposed here simply to offer a few scattered remarks upon the economic position of the teacher.

School-work.—There is reason to believe that teaching at the great grammar schools connected with the 'collegiate churches' of Eton, Westminster, or Winchester was sufficiently lucrative. They were large schools, richly endowed, and frequented by the sons of the wealthy aristocracy. Camden's prosperous career seems to point to this conclusion, though it should be remembered that he had no family to support.

But it is certain that the ordinary stipend of the master of a grammar school afforded but a very scanty provision for his needs, especially if he were married. Salaries ranged from about £5 or £6 to

£20, with, occasionally, a much smaller allowance for an usher to teach the 'petties,' *i.e.*, boys of seven to ten years of age.¹ They had formerly been of greater value, but the ill-judged measures taken under the Chantries Act in the reign of Edward VI, had, by substituting a fixed payment for endowments derived from property, greatly impoverished schools throughout the country. So serious was the depreciation that, under Elizabeth, it was found necessary in some districts to combine the funds of no less than five schools, in order to secure enough to pay a schoolmaster. Five Yorkshire grammar schools could, in 1583, raise only £25 7s. 2d. between them for the support of the master, and other expenses.

It was not that there was lack of good schools, or schools which had done good work—even the pessimist Philip Stubbes admitted that there were 'excellent good schooles, both in cities, townes and countries'²—but they were seriously crippled in their resources, and afforded little inducement to men of learning and genius. This was fully recognized by authorities whose duty it was, in the various districts, to care for education. In an appeal (1548) to the Protector Somerset and the Council against the proposed sale of the endowment of Sedbergh Grammar School, the town authorities plead for more generous treatment of schoolmasters: 'What learned man will go to this provincial spot

¹ For much of the information upon this topic I am indebted to A. F. Leach, 'English Schools before the Reformation,' and 'Yorkshire Schools.'

² 'Anatomy of Abuses,' New Shaks. Soc., ii. 19.

for such a narrow stipend [as £10 a year], when the lands have been taken away? What man of any promise will leave the University . . . to go to a rude people, a sparsely inhabited country, a rough (horridam) neighbourhood, with no vestige of elegance or culture, to hard and intolerable labour, for such a stipend?' It should be noted that nearly all the grammar schools were free,¹ the master being paid a fixed salary derived from landed property.

It is true that there is evidence of extra payments given for extra tuition, or by way of free presents; but there is not sufficient to warrant a belief that this was a frequent custom.²

We know that the grammar school master, Christopher Ocland, was constantly in financial distress, and we know the stipend upon which he had to depend. When the school of St. Olave's, Southwark, was remodelled on an improved footing, in 1571, Ocland was engaged as head master, with the former head, if willing, as his assistant. Ocland's salary was fixed at 20 marks yearly (£13 6s. 8d.), for which he was to teach the 'grammarians,' and help the usher with the 'petytes.' He was, apparently, to be allowed also to receive six or eight boarders to eke out his income.³ He found it

¹ Mr. Leach has shown that the term 'Free School' bears the obvious meaning, *i.e.*, 'a school giving gratuitous education.'

² At an earlier period, and the custom may have continued, the schoolmaster expected frequent invitations to dine or sup with the parents of scholars. The early manuals of Latin contain ready-made forms of invitation from the boy to his master, and no doubt the teacher saw to it that the boy used them.

³ 'Camden Soc.,' vol. 23, p. 65-66.

quite impossible to live upon these meagre resources, and was constantly petitioning great officials for some substantial patronage. In 1580 he gave up teaching, and tried to gain a living by writing, with little success. In 1590 we find him living at Greenwich, because his debts make it impossible for him to be in London; he is teaching again, but his labours 'will not fynde' him 'mete and drynck.' He petitions Burleigh in most abject terms: 'Helpe, my very goode Lorde, my singular good Lorde, helpe I praie and most humbly desyre your honor for God's sake, your most poor and unfortunate Christopher.'¹ Still later, we find it proposed to relieve the poverty of his widow, by giving her the next vacant post as 'coal-measurer at the waterside.'²

Teachers in the elementary schools, and those with private schools of their own, fared even worse. The ordinary rate of payment was from twopence to sixpence a week for each child, in the private school; in the public school, probably, there was a fixed salary. That the pay was low, however, is only too clear. Stubbes states that in the 'inferior schools, . . . such small pittance is allowed the schoole-masters, as they can . . . hardly maintaine themselves . . . they teach and take paines for little or nothing.'³ Gibes at 'hungry scholars,' who spend their time teaching children their horn-books, or drudging over 'pueriles confabulationes' with 'a companie of seven-year old apes,'⁴ are frequently

¹ 'Camden Soc.,' vol. 23, pp. 73-74.

² 'Acts of the Privy Council' (7th June, 1593), vol. xxiv.

³ 'Anatomy of Abuses,' ii, 20-21.

⁴ 'Pilgrimage to Parnassus' (1597), ed. Mackay, p. 21.

met with. 'As lousy as a schoolmaster'¹ was a comparison that could apparently be used without inappropriateness.

The labours of the schoolmaster were by no means nominal. The ordinary grammar school hours averaged from seven to eight a day; and, if we may judge from the account given by a seventeenth century schoolmaster of Rotherham, the curriculum was sufficiently varied and exacting. The 'petties' learnt accident, syntax, and easy Latin translation; the boys in the higher forms studied Terence, Ovid, Cicero, Virgil, Horace, Seneca, Juvenal, Persius, Isocrates, Hesiod, Homer, and sometimes even Hebrew. They wrote themes and Latin verses, and they held disputations. The task of superintending such a mass of work, even with the assistance of an usher and a few of the older boys, can have left very little leisure or energy for original writing.

Other duties less congenial than that of reading classic authors fell to the lot of the schoolmaster. Even the "collegiate" schoolmasters were required to attend to details which must have been very irksome, and they were at times treated with scant courtesy, as the following letter will show. It is from the irate parent of a boy whose epistolary skill appears to be defective:

'Roger Coppez to J. Harman at Winchester, 1593, Dec. 18.—Look to Anthony Coppez, your scholar, and command him not to write unto "my" but to make you privy to it, for his hand is very bad, and the manner of writing worse, as you see

¹ 'The Puritan,' i, sc. 2.

by the letter that he send unto "my," and from henceforward let him not write but in Latin when he can do it of himself, and not else; and, I pray, good Mr. Harman, speak to one that may teach him to write very fear (*sic*). The bearer hereof is my brother, and he shall tell you my mind at large.'¹

Private teaching.—The lot of tutors in private families must have varied greatly. Samuel Daniel was treated as an honoured friend, so also was W. Browne. In the ordinary middle-class family, especially if of the class of *nouveaux-riches*, his position was certainly far from pleasant. The satiric picture of the tutor drawn in the 'Returne from Parnassus,' is doubtless highly coloured; but it must have borne some relation to fact. He is to be content to fare like the servants, living on bread and beer and bacon: he is to wait at meals; to work all harvest time; and never to begin his teaching without an obeisance to his pupil. For all this he is to receive five marks a year, and a gift from his master's cast-off wardrobe.² The employer was held responsible for the orthodoxy of the private teacher, a penalty of £10 being imposed in 1580 upon all who had in their houses schoolmasters who did not attend church!³

Besides Daniel and W. Browne, three other writers held the position of family tutor.⁴

Of professional writers under Elizabeth and James I, only three, Camden, Ocland, and Shirley,

¹ Cal. MSS. Hatfield, 438.

² Part i, pp. 45-46 (ed. Mackay).

³ J. S. Burn, 'The Court of High Commission,' p. 9 n.

⁴ They were John Foxe, Stephen Gosson, and William Webbe.

are known to have been school teachers, and the two latter gave up the profession when they turned to writing.¹ There is a legend that Shakespeare, before he went to London, spent a little time teaching in the country. John Davies was a 'writing-master,' and John Florio a 'master of languages'; but their position, with a private aristocratic *clientèle*, differed greatly from that of the ordinary schoolmaster.

Two other occasional writers who were also schoolmasters, are Richard Knolles, and Francis Meres.

Holy Orders.—Nor could the Church offer an enviable refuge to the needy literary man, except in the higher ranks. Throughout the great part of this period, in spite of strenuous efforts at remedy, the financial position, social status, and intellectual qualifications of the average country clergy were such as to bring great discredit upon the profession of Holy Orders. This was largely the result of the uncertainty of the last three reigns, which had driven out of the ranks of the clergy many of the most earnest and best qualified men, and had discouraged those who would naturally have entered Holy Orders.

Moreover, the necessity, in the earlier years of Elizabeth's reign, of supplying pastors to the many communities left without any ecclesiastical leader,

¹ Mr. Arthur Acheson would add Chapman to their number, suggesting that he may have kept school 'on the hill next Hitchen's left hand,' so as to qualify himself for identification with Holofernes, who educated youth at the change-house 'on the top of the mountain.' ('Shakespeare and the rival Poet,' p. 110 *seq.*)

was so urgent that it forced archbishops into filling up the vacancies with most injudicious haste. Parker, in 1559, ordained one hundred and fifty clergy in one day;¹ Grindal ordained one hundred in his first month of office. The results were most disastrous. Large numbers of those ordained were quite unqualified, and served only to degrade their order in public estimation. They are held in general contempt. 'Wherefore the greatest part of the more excellent wits choose rather to employ their studies unto physike and the lawes, utterlie giving over the studie of the scriptures, for feare least they should in time not get their bread by the same.'² 'Some do bestow advowsons of benefices upon their bakers, butlers, cookes . . . and horse-keepers.'³

They were ignorant: some of them, it was said, 'such as can scarcely read true English.' Many of them, moreover, were of unclean life, utterly unfitted, even morally, for their office: 'They will read you their service . . . and when they have done they will to all kinds of wanton pastimes and delights . . . and all the week after, yea, all the year . . . they will not stick to keep company at the alehouse from morning till night, tippling and swilling.' They are 'fitter to feed hogs than Christian souls.'⁴

Undoubtedly the zealous efforts of the higher

¹ Frere, 'Eng. Church under Eliz. and James I,' p. 60.

² Harrison, 'Description of England' (New Shaks. Soc., part i, p. 37).

³ Harrison, *ut supra*, p. 26.

⁴ Philip Stubbes, 'Anatomy of Abuses,' 1583. (New Shaks. Soc., ii, p. 77.) The picture is doubtless a little overdrawn.

clergy, and the government, did much gradually to improve this situation.

Already, by 1577, Harrison notes a considerable advance in intellectual qualifications; men are no longer ordained upon such slender acquirements as availed twelve or fifteen years before, 'when there was small choice.'¹ He is even enthusiastic as to the learning and zeal of the higher clergy at the time when he writes; but this is due largely to his patriotic pride in the fact that they are now chosen from among Englishmen, and are no longer 'strangers, especiallie out of Italie.'² It was more than ten years afterwards that Ponsonby published Spenser's bitterly satiric sketch of the country parson in 'Mother Hubbard's Tale' (published 1591):

. . . Read he could not evidence, nor will
 Ne tell a written word, ne write a letter,
 Ne make one title worse, ne make one better:
 Of such deep learning little had he neede,
 Ne yet of Latine, ne of Greeke, that breede
 Doubts amongst Divines, and difference of texts,
 From whence arise diversitie of sects,
 And hateful heresies, of God abhorr'd:
 But this good sir did follow the plaine word,
 Ne medled with their controversies vaine:
 All his care was, his service well to saine,
 And to read Homelies upon holidayes;
 When that was done he might attend his playes;
 An easy life, and fit high God to please!

There was thus very little inducement for the man of attainments to select the career of parish

¹ Harrison, 'Description of England' (New Shaks. Soc.), part i, p. 26.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 14-15.

priest, though it is possible that, in the earlier years of the period, he would have been readily beneficed.

Value of Benefices.—But when we come to investigate the value of the average benefice, we are no longer surprised that few writers should appear to have even dreamed of qualifying for one. The poverty of the clergy is a standing topic. It supplies upon one occasion a telling simile for Dekker, who describes a footpath as being ‘beaten more bare than the livings of Churchmen.’¹ The same writer publishes a small collection of private prayers, including one for the clergy, which reveals incidentally the light in which they are regarded—as objects for charity! ‘As they break unto us,’ runs the prayer, ‘the bread of life (which Thou sendest . . .) so grant (O Lord) that we may not suffer them to starve for earthly bread, but that like brothers we may relieve them.’²

Ten, twelve, thirty pounds at most, is the common annual value of a living. Stubbes says they range as low as £5, £4, and even £2 a year. ‘Yea, and table themselves also of the same.’³ Moreover, the whole first year’s income has to go to the crown, besides a yearly tenth; so that out of a benefice of £20, ‘the incumbent thinketh himself well acquitted if, all ordinarie payments being dischargd, he may reserve £13 6s. 8d. towards his own sustentation, and maintenance of his familie.’⁴ This is

¹ Dekker, ‘News from Hell,’ ‘Works,’ ed. Grosart, ii.

² ‘Four Birds of Noah’s Ark,’ ‘Works,’ v. 49.

³ ‘Anatomic of Abuses’ (New Shaks. Soc., ii. 75.)

⁴ Harrison, ‘Descr. Eng.,’ i. 24.

as if the majority of livings at the present day were worth from £60 to £80!

Simony.—Nor are these legal payments all that are incurred by the unhappy parson. Patrons, infected with the prevalent greed, or need of money, demand heavy fees from the unlucky incumbent, amounting at times to as much as three-fourths annually of the total income. They will reduce £40 to £10 by their exactions.¹ The patron will covenant that

If the living yearly do arise
To fortie pound, that then his youngest son
Shall twentie haue, and twentie thou hast wonne,
Thou hast it wonne, for it is of franke gift.”²

In 1609, Ralph Cleaton, a curate-in-charge at Buxton, possessed the large income of £5—all the tithes going to the patron.³ That excellent witty satire, the ‘Returne from Parnassus’ (1601) has an amusing scene treating of this theme, employing for the purpose the conventional echo-motif:

Acad. Faine would I haue a liuing, if I could tel how to come by it. *Eccho.* Buy it.

. . . *Acad.* What, is the world a game, are liuings gotten by playing? *Eccho.* Paying.

Acad. Paying? but say what’s the nearest way to come by a liuing? *Eccho.* Giving.⁴

Unfortunate vicars, unable to keep house upon their scanty stipends, were driven to lodge at the ale-house; one, in despair of making ends meet,

¹ Philip Stubbes, ‘Anatomy of Abuses,’ 1583, part ii, 80.

² Spenser, ‘Mother Hubbard’s Tale.’

³ Lodge, ‘Illustrations of History,’ iii, 390.

⁴ ‘Returne from Parnassus,’ ed. Mackay, part ii, p. 98.

even begs to be allowed to sell ale himself.¹ Nash had probably sufficient grounds for his irritating sneer at Gabriel Harvey's parson brother Richard, whom he called 'a dolefull foure nobles curate, nothing so good as the confessor of Tyburne,' declaring that he 'hath scarce so much ecclesiasticall living in all as will serve to buy him crewell strings to his bookes, and haire buttons.'² We know that the poor fellow had to eke out his living by recourse to the lowest form of writing—astrological almanacs!

It is true that during the later years of Elizabeth, and under James I, matters somewhat improved. In point of learning, morality, and social status great reforms were effected, and it is probable that under Charles I and Laud still more was done. In 1633 we find a certain Hugh Thomson receiving a stipend of £60 upon his entry into the ministry, a sum raised later to £100.³

The foregoing remarks will have made it clear that, could an aspirant to literary fame have succeeded in obtaining a benefice, the inevitable sacrifice of congenial society, and of access to books, and the social ignominy incurred, were amply sufficient to deter him, even had the financial gain been much more considerable than is apparent. In fact, out of about a hundred and ten writers only nine appear to have taken Holy Orders, and

¹ Lodge, 'Illustrations of History,' iii, p. 391.

² 'Have with you . . .' 'Works,' iii, 14.

³ Egerton MSS. 784. It should be remarked that it is not clear whether Thomson was an Anglican pastor, or belonged to one of the various dissenting sects.

three only of these can be called professional writers.¹

Hakluyt almost certainly endeavoured by his writings to attract patronage, and he actually held several ecclesiastical preferments. Shirley, at one time a 'minister,' seems to have abandoned that calling when he 'set up for a play-maker.'

Marston's abandonment of drama for the Church only serves to show that the literary career was not found thoroughly compatible with the clerical.²

PH. SHEAVYN.

¹ They are: Andrewes, Donne (not a professional writer in our sense), Fleming, Hakluyt, Hall, Harrison, Marston, Meres, and Shirley.

² Herrick probably obtained his living in Devonshire (1629) on the score of his early verses. But it is noteworthy that it was not until about the time of his ejection from his living (1648) that he printed his poems.

THE PRINTER OF BORDE'S 'INTRODUCTION OF KNOWLEDGE.'



N several of his other books Andrew Borde refers to the printing of his 'Introduction of Knowledge,' which was issued in or shortly after 1548 by William Copland.

In the 'Breviary of Healthe' he writes: 'In my Anothomy in the Introduction of Knowledge, whiche hath been longe a pryntynge, for lacke of money and paper; and it is in pryntynge with pyctures at Roberte Coplande, prynter.' And again 'as it appereth more largely in the Introduction of Knowledge, a boke of my makynge, beyng a pryntynge with Ro. Coplande.'

In the 'Pryncyples of Astronamye' we find 'latt them loke in a book namyd the Introduction of Knowleg, a boke of my makynge the which ys a printynge at old Robert Coplands, the eldist printer of England.'

Finally, in the 'Dyetary of Helth' we read: 'But yf it shall please your grace to loke on a boke the which I dyd make in MOUNTPYLLER, named the Introductory of Knowledge, there shall you se many new matters, the whiche I have no doubt but that your grace wyl accept and lyke the boke, the whiche is a pryntynge besyde saynt Dunstons church within Temple barre, over agaynst the Temple.'

‘INTRODUCTION OF KNOWLEDGE.’ 31

Now the three first quotations clearly and definitely state that the ‘Introductory of Knowledge’ was printed by Robert Copland; but so far as I am aware, no bibliographer has noticed that the last quotation affords direct information to the contrary. The printing office ‘beside S^t Dunstan’s church, over against the Temple,’ was of course William Middleton’s, the George, which had previously been occupied by Pynson and Redman; Copland’s office, the Rose Garland, was on the opposite side of the street, and much further east. In the colophon to the ‘Recuile of the Histories of Troie’ of 1553 it is said to have been printed ‘in Fletestrete at the Signe of the Rose Garlande nyghe unto Flete brydge.’ Besides this we have still more definite information. Amongst other property left by will by Thomas Alsop in 1557 was ‘2 mesuages and 1 garden . . . in the several tenures of William Copland, stationer, and Dionisius Bayly, spurrier, situate in the parish of S^t Bridget in Fleetstreet, London, to wit, between the tenements of John Conyngham and Thomas Jacson, on the east, the tenements of George James and Thomas Pole on the west, the tenement in the tenure of Sir Thomas Grey on the south, and the highway of Fleet Street on the North.’

The next point to settle is the date when these various statements of Borde’s were made. The earliest seems to be that in the ‘Dietary of Helthe,’ for it is made in the dedication, which is dated 1542, and the book itself was printed about the same time by Wyer for John Gowghe, who died in 1543. In 1542, then, Borde stated that his ‘In-

roduction of Knowledge' was being printed beside St. Dunstan's Church, that is at Middleton's. The 'Breviary of Healthe' was probably written about the same time as the 'Dietary,' and was 'examined' in Oxford in June, 1546, but no edition is known to have been printed earlier than Middleton's of 1547, and no copy of this seems to be extant. Borde's two references to Robert Copland occur in the text of this book, and there was nothing to prevent their being added any time before 1547. When the 'Pryncyples of Astronamye' was written we have no clear evidence, but the printing may be ascribed to 1547.

There is one interesting point to be noticed. A new edition of the 'Dietary of Helthe' was printed in 1547 by William Powell, Middleton's successor at the George. It contains a re-written preface by Borde dated May, 1547, and he omits the passage 'the whiche is a pryntyng besyde saynt Dunstons church within Temple barre, over against the Temple.'

Does this mean that by this time an edition of the 'Introduction of Knowledge' had already been issued by Middleton, or had the work been transferred from Middleton to Copland, and did Borde hesitate to advertise that fact in a work issued by Middleton's successor?

In 1542 Middleton's press was an active one, and was quite equal to issuing Borde's book at once, and yet from these various quotations it would appear that a work which was in the press in 1542 was still unfinished in 1547-8.

After W. de Worde's death in 1535 we hear

‘INTRODUCTION OF KNOWLEDGE.’ 33

little of Robert Copland, and it is doubtful whether after this time he engaged in practical printing. His name is found in only one book as a printer, the ‘Pryncyples of Astronamye,’ ascribed to 1547, and I think it is quite probable that a careful examination of this book would show it to be the work of some other printer.

Copland we know was very poor. In the subsidy assessment of 1544 his goods were valued at only one pound, the lowest of any printer or stationer in Fleet Street, while Berthelet stands at £400. The ‘lacke of money and paper’ which Borde speaks of would certainly apply to him, and he may have been working slowly at an illustrated edition of the ‘Introduction.’

With our present knowledge it is impossible to account for these conflicting assertions of Borde, and they can only be left for future discoveries to explain.

E. GORDON DUFF.

THE LADY MARGARET AS A LOVER OF LITERATURE.

THE great foundations of Christ's College and St. John's College, at Cambridge, are lasting monuments of the wealth and liberality of Margaret Beaufort, Countess of Richmond and Derby. This princess was in her lifetime, as after her death, a patron of learning and literature.¹

The education of women was still neglected in her day, but the Lady Margaret was more fortunate than some of her sisters. She learned French, but her acquaintance with Latin, as she lamented, was somewhat elementary, though she knew sufficient to follow the church services. She had a good memory and natural ability. She was a skilful and artistic needlewoman. 'Right studious she was in books, which she had in great number, both in English and in French,' as Bishop Fisher testifies. Some of her books we know by name. Ann, Duchess of Buckingham, who was the Lady Margaret's mother-in-law, died in 1480, and bequeathed to her 'a book of English called "Legenda Sanctorum," a book of French called "Lucun,"² another book of French of the epistles and gospels, and a

¹ For fuller details as to the Lady Margaret, the memoir by C. A. Halsted and that by C. H. Cooper, edited by J. E. B. Mayor, must be consulted.

² Sir H. Nicolas prints this 'Lucum.' See 'Testamenta Vetusta,' p. 357.

primer with clasps of silver gilt covered with purple velvet.' Professor J. E. B. Mayor has suggested that by 'Lucun' is meant the translation of Lucan, Sallust and Suetonius, printed for Vêrard at Paris in 1490.

Bishop Fisher bears testimony to the devoutness and ascetic spirit of the Lady Margaret, but her austerities were not incompatible with the enjoyment of dramatic entertainments or the sports of an abbot of misrule that did right well his office. On the occasion of the marriage of Catharine of Aragon and Prince Arthur she was one of the spectators of a pageant in which one of the performers represented the Almighty, and delivered a sermon in verse. The Sunday entertainments included plays, dancing, dicing, carding, archery, etc. She had a band of minstrels under her patronage, and to these the town of Cambridge in 1491 gave red wine at a charge of five pence. On 3rd December, 1497, £3 6s. 8d. was paid out of the King's privy purse 'to my lady King's moder poet.' And it has been suggested that Lady Margaret's laureate was Erasmus. We should like to think so.

The Lady Margaret was a patron of the first English printer, and of two of his successors. William Caxton tells us that he had sold to the Lady Margaret a copy of 'Blanchardine et Eglantine' in French, and at a later period she returned the book to him to be translated into English. This version he printed about 1489 with a dedication 'beseeching my said lady's bounteous grace to receive this little book in gree of me her humble servant and to pardon me of the rude and common

36 THE LADY MARGARET AS A

English, wheras shall be found fault, for I confess me not learned, ne knowing the art of rhetoric, ne of such gay terms as now be said in these days and used. But I hope that it shall be understandon of the readers and hearers; and that shall suffice.' This last sentence is omitted by Blades. It may be noted that Caxton erroneously calls his patroness Duchess of Somerset, as though she had inherited the title as well as the estates of her father.

In 1494 an English version of Walter Hylton's 'Scala Perfectionis' was printed in the house of William Caxton by Wynkyn de Worde at the command of the Lady Margaret, as appears by some verses, strangely punctuated, at the end.

Lenuoye.

Infynite laude wyth thankynges many folde
I yelde to god me socouryng wyth his grace
This boke to finyssh whiche that ye beholde
Scale of perfeccion calde in euery place
Whereof thauȝtor walter Hilton was
And wynkyn de worde this hath sett in prynt
In willyam Caxtons hows so fyll the case
God rest his soule. In Joy there mot it stynt
This heuenly boke more precyous than golde
Was late direct wyth great humylyte
For godly plesur. theron to beholde
Unto the right noble Margaret as ye see
The kyngis moder of excellent bounte
Henry the seuenth that Jhū hym preserue
This mighty pryncesse hath cōmaunded me
Temprynt this boke her grace for to deserue.

At the 'exortacion and sterynge' of the Countess, her confessor, Bishop Fisher, published his treatise

on the seven penitential psalms, which was printed by Pynson in 1505 and 1510, and by Wynkyn de Worde in 1508, 1509, 1525, and 1529. The bishop states that his patroness delighted greatly in these Psalms. Wynkyn de Worde in 1509 when he issued the 'Parlyament of Devils' and the 'Gospel of Nicodemus,' and in the colophons styles himself 'Prynter vnto the moost excellent Pryncesse my lady the Kynges mother.'

Bishop Fisher's funeral sermon for Henry VII, preached at St. Paul's, 10th March, 1509, was printed by Wynkyn de Worde at the special request of the Lady Margaret.¹

Henry Watson, at the request of Wynkyn de Worde, who had been moved thereto by the Lady Margaret, translated Brant's 'Ship of Fools' from French into English, and although very inferior to Alexander Barclay's metrical version, this reached a second edition in 1517. Pynson printed a 'Breviarium Sarisburiense' at the expense of the Countess, but the date is not known. Dyce suggests that 'my lady's grace,' whom Skelton mentions as the patroness of his last translation from French into English prose 'Of Mannes Lyfe the Peregrynacioun,' was the Lady Margaret.

The Lady Margaret was not only a patron of literature, but a labourer therein. Perhaps we ought to reckon among her literary efforts the 'Ordinances and Reformations of Apparel for Princes and estates with other ladies and gentlewomen for the

¹ This sermon and that by the same prelate for the Lady Margaret are said to be the earliest printed examples of that form of literature.

time of mourning,' of which there are several manuscript copies. The Statutes of Christ's College are said to be 'framed' by the Countess in 1506, but, as they are in Latin, we may conclude that they were not her composition. The very detailed comparison of a college and the various parts of the human body appears to have been a commonplace of the period.¹

By the 'request and commandment of the Lady Margaret,' a translation from the Latin of the 'Imitatio Christi' was made by Dr. William Atkynson, and printed 'by Wynkynde Worde in Fleet Street at the sign of the Sun.' The fourth book was translated by the Lady Margaret from the French, and printed by the same printer in 1504.¹

As a specimen of her skill as a translator, it may suffice to give the last paragraph of her translation. We give the Latin text, Lady Margaret's rendering from the French, and Dr. W. A. Copinger's 'absolutely literal translation of the original.'

Nam fides et amor ibi maximè praececellunt, et occultis modis in hoc sanctissimo et superexcellentissimo sacramento operantur. Deus aeternus et immensus, infinitaeque potentiae, facit magna et inscrutabilia in coelo et in terra, nec est investigatio mirabilium operum ejus. Si talia essent opera Dei, ut faciliè ab humana ratione caperentur, non esset mirabilia nec ineffabilia dicenda.

¹ Cooper, pp. 101, 251.

² This is included in Dr. J. K. Ingram's early English edition of the 'De Imitatione Christi' (Early English Text Society's extra series, lxxiii, 1893).

Lady Margaret's Version.

Fast faith and true love surmounteth all curious inquisition, principally in this matter, and marvellously openeth to understanding in secret manner of this holy and right excellent sacrament. O eternal God, and without measure of might and bounty, which hast made the infinite great and wonderful things in the heaven and earth, which none is sufficient to inquire, understand or find the secrets of thy so marvellous works, and therefore they be called inestimable, for man's reason neither may nor can comprehend thy works. To whom, Lord God Almighty, be given laud and praising withouten end.

Dr. Copenger's Version.

For faith and love here shine forth most abundantly and work in hidden ways in this most holy and transcendent Sacrament. God who is eternal and incomprehensible and of infinite power, doth things inscrutable in heaven and earth and there is no searching out of His wonderful works. If the works of God were such as might be easily comprehended by human reason, they could neither be called wonderful nor unspeakable.

Here it is easy to see that in the diffuse version of the Lady Margaret there is the influence of a modern language less compact in its structure than the Latin. The only word she uses that can be regarded as obsolete is *withouten*. The rest of her vocabulary is absolutely modern, although it is more than four centuries since she wrote the paragraph we have quoted.

About 1507 appeared 'The Mirroure of Golde for the sinfull Soule,' which she had turned from a French version into English. It was printed by Pynson and several times reprinted.

This presente boke (we quote from the edition of 1522) is called the *Mirrore of golde to y^e sinfull soule*/ the whiche hath ben trāslated at parice oute of laten into frenche/ and after the trāslation seen & corrected/ at length of many clarkis/ Doctours/ & maisters in diuinitie/ and nowe of late translatede oute of frenche ito Englisthe by the right excellēt princesse Margarete moder to oure souerain lorde kinge Henry the .vii. and Countesse of Richemond & derby.

The British Museum Catalogue describes it as a translation of the '*Speculum aureum animae peccatricis*' of Denis de Leeuwis, de Rickel. This author, known as the '*Doctor Extaticus*,' whose name was latinized as Dionysius à Leewis, was born at Rickel, in the bishopric of Liège in 1394 and died in 1471. He was educated at Cologne, joined the Carthusian order, and was the author of above a hundred theological books. Some of these are controversial, but for the most part his writings are exegetical or didactic. In 1608 his body was exhumed by an admiring bishop, and the bones were for the most part still adherent. Foppens adds: '*Et, quod tota miretur posteritas, pollex et index manus dexteræ, duo nimirum scriptendorum librorum instrumenta maximè necessaria, integri, carnosì et vividi.*'¹

The Lady Margaret's will further illustrates her claims as a lover of literature. To her chapel at Westminster she left a '*portuous*,' and a book having in the beginning certain images with prayers to them; and after them the primer and psalter. These were to be chained. To Durham monastery she left a

¹ Foppens: '*Bibliotheca Belgica*,' i, 244.

Sarum mass book. A mass book was bequeathed to the parish of Colyweston. To the King she left 'a French book of vellum with diverse stories, at the beginning the book of Genesis with pictures limned, a great volume of vellum covered with black velvet which is the second volume of Froissart, a great volume of vellum named John Bokas lymned, and a great volume of vellum of the siege of Troy in English.' We need not suppose Boccaccio's book to have been the 'Decamerone'; it is more likely to have been Lydgate's translation of the 'Falls of Princes,' and the following item to have been his 'Troy book.' John St. John became the happy possessor of a book of vellum of 'Canterbury Tales' in English. Alexander Frognall received 'a printed book which is called Magna Carta in French.' In the executors' accounts books are mentioned, but the titles are not specified.

Truly the memory of the Lady Margaret should be had in honour and grateful remembrance by the lovers of literature and learning.

WILLIAM E. A. AXON.

STEPHEN BULKLEY, PRINTER.



GOOD many years have elapsed since Robert Davies wrote his memoir of the York Press. In the interval the bibliographical horizon has widened considerably, and many new facts unknown to that author have come to light. In writing of Stephen Bulkley, Robert Davies knew nothing of his antecedents before he went to York, neither who he was, where he came from, nor the reason of his coming. Mr. Allnutt, in his investigations into the work of the provincial presses, did not go beyond the information supplied by his predecessor, nor has any one since attempted to penetrate the background of obscurity that hid the antecedents of Stephen Bulkley from view. A chance discovery has, however, led the way to a reconstruction of the history of Stephen Bulkley, which we are now able to give in a comparatively complete form. In the Apprenticeship Register of the Company of Stationers for the year 1630 are the following entries:

"7th June, 1630. Thomas Buckley, son of Joseph Buckley of Canterbury in the County of Kent, Stationer, hath put himself apprentice to Robert Barker for 7 years.

"7th Feb: 1630 (*i.e.* 1631). Steven Bulkley, son of Joseph Bulkley, of Canterbury, in the County

of Kent, Bookseller, hath put himself apprentice unto Adam Islip for 8 years from Candlemas Day last."

These two entries clearly refer to two sons of the Canterbury bookseller, of whom we have a mention in the imprint of a book in the British Museum, a sermon preached in Canterbury Cathedral by the Reverend Thomas Jackson, one of the prebendaries. The imprint runs: "London, printed by John Haviland for Joseph Bulkley and are to be sold at his shop in Canterbury. 1622."

The different spelling of the surname occurs throughout the history of Stephen Bulkley, his name being written as frequently Buckley as Bulkley. It has even been continued to modern times, for in Mr. Gray's Index to Hazlitt, he mentions Stephen Buckley, printer at York, and Stephen Bulkley, printer at Gateshead, referring in each case to the same man. It is necessary to keep this in mind to understand what follows.

On the completion of the eight years of Stephen Bulkley's apprenticeship, he took up his freedom on the 4th February, 1639, his name appearing in the entry in Mr. Arber's 'Transcript' (vol. iii, p. 688) as Stephen Buckley. During the next two years Bulkley seems to have been in partnership with a printer named John Beale, who was then nearing the end of his career. Several books bearing the imprint 'London, printed by J. B. and S. B.', appeared during the years 1640 and 1641. One of these is a quarto entitled 'The Secretary in fashion, or a compendious and refined way of expression in all manner of letters, composed in French by R. de

la Serre, historiographer of France and translated into English by John Massinger, gent.' Another is a folio, a heavy theological work, entitled 'A general view of the Holy Scriptures;' both bear the date 1640. In the following year we find a third book,¹ also of a theological character with these initials; and, finally, a work entitled 'Sol Britannicus,' a fulsome essay in Latin on the virtues of King Charles I, in which the imprint runs: 'Londini excudebat J. Beale & S. Buckley. 1641.'

The principal types used in printing 'Sol Britannicus' were a double pica roman in the Dedicatory Epistle, a double pica italic on the last leaf, a great primer roman and italic for the text, and a fount of greek type. This double pica italic is also found in the dedication to the reader of the 'Counterpoison,' and in one of those prefixed to the 'Secretary in Fashion.' The double pica roman is also found in use in the first dedication of the 'Secretary,' and the great primer roman in another part of it, while the text of that book was printed in two distinct founts of english roman, the division being noticeable at the commencement of sig. 1.

The text of the 'Counterpoyson,' was a much smaller type, a fount of pica roman and italic, the roman being very unevenly cast, but noticeable as having the lower case 'o' in a more rounded form than in the larger founts. A fount of black letter was also used in this book.

Before the 5th May, 1641, the partnership was apparently dissolved, and Bulkley set up for himself

¹ A Counterpoyson: or, soverain antidote againste all grieffe. . . . By R. Young (B. M. 4405, cc. 36).

in St. Martin's parish, Aldersgate. Three examples of his work at this time are certainly known, one being a small octavo volume of which no less than three issues have recently come to light. Of one of these, only the title-page is preserved in the Ames Collection at the British Museum (463 h. 3, No. 1678).

The | Masse | in Latine | and English. | With a Commentary | and observations upon it. | Wherein also are described the se- | verall sorts of Masses, with the ridiculous- | nesse of their Mysteries, absurditie of | their Ceremonies, and Originall of every | piece of the Masse: And that (after | the Word of God) nothing is so con- | trary unto the Masse, as the | very Masse itselfe. | Written in French by Peter du | Moulin, Doctor and Pro- | fessor in Divinitie. | [Line.] | And Englished | By James Mountaine. | [Line] | London, | Printed by Stephen Bulkley, for Robert | Somer and Thomas Cowley at the Greyhound | in St. Pauls Church-yard. 1641.

No copy of this book was to be found in the British Museum, but on consulting the Catalogue of the Bodleian Library what appeared to be a copy was found there, and in answer to inquiries Mr. Falconer Madan courteously sent the following transcript of the title-page of the book in that library.

The | Masse in | latin and | english. | With a Commentary | and observations upon it. | Wherein also are described the se- | verall sorts of Masses, with the ridiculous- | nesse of their Mysteries, absurditie of | their Ceremonies, and originall of every | piece of the Masse: And that (after | the Word of God) nothing is so | contrary unto the Masse, as | the very Masse itselfe. | Written in French by Peter du | Moulin, Doctor and

46 STEPHEN BULKLEY, PRINTER.

Pro- | fessor in Divinitie. | And Englished | by James Mountaine. | [Line] | London; | Printed by Steven Bulkley, and are to be sold | by Rob: Somer and Tho: Cowley at the Grey-hound | in St. Pauls Churchyard. 1641.

A comparison of the two title-pages showed that there were two issues of that year, or at least two different settings of the title-page. Since then, in fact within the last fortnight, the British Museum has acquired a copy of the book, which, by the courtesy of Mr. Esdaile, we have been allowed to examine. The title-page of this runs as follows:

The | Masse | In | Latine and English | With A | Commentary | and Observations upon it. | Wherein also are described the | several sorts of Masses, with the | ridiculousness of their Myste- | ries, absurdity of their Cere- | monies, and Original | of every piece of | the Masse. | [Line] | Written in French by the Fa- | mous Peter du Moulin. | [Line] | And now made English | By James Mountaine. | London, | Printed by S. B. for R. S. in Covent | Garden.

Size. Octavo.

Collation; Title, one leaf, verso blank. The work, B-Z Aa-Cc in eights, Dd one leaf,—pp. 402, with catchwords, pagination, and running title in italics. Twenty-nine lines to a full page.

As it was impossible to put this and the Bodleian copy side by side for purposes of comparison, a description of the Museum copy was sent to Mr. Madan, who in reply expresses the opinion that the British Museum copy is a re-issue of the Bodleian edition, the sheets of text (pp. 1-400) being identical. But the re-issue has a new title-page, and lacks all the preliminary matter (dedication, adver-

tisement, contents, and errata), and also wants the leaf Dd2 bearing the imprimatur dated 'May 5th 1641.' This date is of importance, as it implies that Bulkley set up for himself after the publication of 'Sol Britannicus,' which bears the imprimatur, April 7th, 1641.

The type used in printing the text of the 'Masse' was the pica previously used in the 'Counter poyson,' with the headings to chapters in italic.

The other two issues traced to Bulkley's press before he left London, are those mentioned in the following notes taken from the Journals of the House of Commons. The first, under the date, Feb: 1. 1641 (*i.e.* 1642):

'Ordered that the pamphlet entitled "The Resolution of the Roundheads" be referred to the Committee for printing and Stephen Buckle in St. Martins London who is said to be the printer of this pamphlet is ordered to attend that committee.'

This was a quarto pamphlet of four leaves or eight pages, of which the following is the full title:

The | Resolution | of the | Round- | Heads: | Being a
Zealous | Declaration of the | Grievances where- | with
their little | wits are consumed | to Destruction. | And |
What things they (in their Wisdome | yet left them)
conceive fit | to be reformed. | [Two rows of printers
ornaments.] | London, | Printed Anno Domini, 1642.

The first twelve lines of the title-page were printed in various founts of roman capitals from canon downwards. The ornaments, consisting of the rose, thistle, harp, fleur-de-lys, and other non-

48 STEPHEN BULKLEY, PRINTER.

descript pieces, were of a common character. The text begins on the signature A2. with a band of the same ornaments at the top, and a large five-line Roman 'W.' The text is printed in English size, l.c. roman. The fount was a very mixed one, the 'a' being a very badly-cut letter, the 'o' being oftentimes a larger face, and many others having a battered and worn appearance. The presswork is particularly bad, the lines being irregular, crooked, and over-inked. This type can be identified as that used in the second half of the 'Secretary in Fashion.'

What was done to the printer on this occasion we are not told, but on 15th June, 1642, occurs another entry in the Journals as follows:

'Resolved that Stephen Buckley dwelling in St. Martins near Aldersgate who printed a scandalous pamphlet called "New Orders," be forthwith sent for as a delinquent.'

This was also a quarto of four leaves, and its title ran:

New | Orders | new, | Agreed upon by a | Parliament |
of | Round-Heads. | Confirmed by the Brethren of the |
New Separation Assembled at Round- | heads Hall with-
out Cripple Gate. | With the great discretion of Master
Long | Breath an upright New inspired Cobler | Speaker
of the House. | Avowed by Ananias Dulman, alias Prick-
eares | Cler. Parl. Round. | [Two rows of printers orna-
ments.] | London, Printed for T. U. 1642.

With the exception of the printer's ornaments on the title-page, which differ from those on the previous pamphlet, the type and ornaments are the

same, and the same faults of presswork are observable.

From an inspection of these three books it becomes clear that at the dissolution of the partnership between Beale and Bulkley, the latter retained most, if not all, the stock of letters and ornaments, but the various pictorial initials seen in the J. B. and S. B. books, apparently belonged to the older printer, as they never appear in any of Bulkley's books, his stock in this respect consisting of a large set of roman caps, such as were used in the two pamphlets above, and one or two worn woodcut initials of no merit.

One is tempted to wonder how many more pamphlets of this description came from Bulkley's London press. A glance through any of the volumes of the Thomason collection for the years 1641 and 1642 show many anonymous tracts that have a strong family likeness to these two, but they are enough to identify his type and show the sort of work he was engaged in.

Needless to say, Stephen Bulkley did not obey the order of the House, but hastily packed his belongings and fled to York, where he set up his press, his first issue appearing on the 23rd July, 1642. A comparison of the broadsides, which are the earliest known examples of his work at York, with the pamphlets issued before he left London, prove that he took with him his stock of letter and ornaments. They suffered considerably on the journey, and he seems to have had some difficulty in getting a good ink in those parts, which further marred the appearance of his work.

On Bulkley's arrival in York he took up his residence in the parish of St. Helen, Stonegate, in which parish his son Stephen was baptised, 16th January, 1645-6.

The first date in connection with Bulkley's work in York is 23rd July, 1642, which appears on a broadside reprint of Sir Benj. Rudyard's speech in the House of Commons on 15th July. This had been printed in London, 'For R. Thrale' on the 17th, and on its receipt in York a reprint was evidently called for.

The King was absent from York from the 6th to the 30th of July. Barker's press had not left York when Bulkley commenced work. In fact we find it working after the 29th August, which is the date of the last document printed. On the 1st September, the King sent orders that the printer and his press should attend him at Nottingham.

Bulkley seems to have done nothing after the publication of the two pamphlets mentioned above, until 1st October, when there was issued from the York press a letter of Lord Falkland's to the Earl of Cumberland. This exists in the British Museum in a London reprint only. Many of Bulkley's publications bear the legend, 'By speciall command,' showing that he was in York in an official capacity, and acted after Barker's departure as King's Printer.

During 1643 and 1644 Bulkley printed many Royalist tracts and sermons. The last of which we have any note is the sermon preached by William Ransom, Vicar of Barton-upon-Humber, in the Minster, on 19th May, before the Marquis of

Newcastle, Lord General. The city was besieged, and the thunder of the Parliamentary cannon must have been loud in the ears of the worshippers. On 2nd July, 1644, the battle of Marston Moor was fought, the Royalist armies were in full flight, and York was in the hands of the Parliamentarians.

What Bulkley did during this period we do not know, but in the summer of 1646, when the King was in Newcastle, practically a prisoner, we find Bulkley starting a press and styling himself, 'Printer to the King's most Excellent Majesty.' A tract appeared at this time purporting to be 'An Answer sent to the Ecclesiastical Assembly at London, by the Reverend, noble and learned man John Diodate, the famous professor of Divinity and most vigilant pastor of Genevah, translated out of Latin into English. Printed at Genevah for the good of Great Britain 1646.' Almost immediately on its appearance this work was denounced as a forgery, and in the London newspaper 'Mercurius Diutinus,' No. 4, December 16-23, 1646, p. 26, occurs the following very definite statement as to its origin:

And in the meane time they [*i.e.* the Prelates] have given us a bone to pick in these two kingdomes, called [Title as above] which is in truth a Peece of Prelaticall forgery, a very fiction, drawne up by some of their Creatures here in England, and (most unworthily) published in the name of that Reverend Divine, said to be printed at Genevah, for the good of great Brittain, 1646. But printed by the new Printer that went from Yorke to the Court at Newcastle. And the author of it tell us (himselfe) that he is a Protestant Malignant, in his last note at the end of it, (the profession of the new sect of Newcastle Covenantiers).

Unfortunately, the only copy known of this tract is in the Advocates' Library, Edinburgh, and it has been impossible to make any comparison of the types. However, the tract has been accepted by the historians of Newcastle typography (the late Mr. J. Hodgson Hinde and Mr. Richard Welford) as a production of Bulkley's press.

The first tract with Bulkley's name from his Newcastle press was an official message from the King to the Speaker of the House of Lords. This showed Bulkley as 'Printer to the King's most Excellent Majesty.'

In 1647 appeared two editions of the Diodate 'Answer.' One with the original title, but with Bulkley's name and the royal arms on the title-page (British Museum), and the other with the title of 'The King's Possessions: Written by His Majesties own Hand; annexed by way of notes to a Letter sent to the Ecclesiastical Assembly at London,' etc. This latter, of which there is a copy in the Bodleian Library, has at the end a certificate from 'one of the scribes of the Assembly,' declaring that 'there was never any such letter sent from Dr. Diodate in the name of the Church of Geneve to the Assembly,' and that it was 'an abominable forgery.' This appears to indicate that this edition is spurious, and was not printed by Bulkley at all, although his name appears in the imprint. Mr. Allnutt, who saw the tract, took this view.¹

In 1649 appeared Bulkley's best known and most important work, 'Chorographia, or a Survey of Newcastle upon Tyne.' It was written by William

¹ 'Bibliographica,' ii. 290.

Gray, a native of the town. The work is one of the earliest attempts at topography in the northern counties. There are two copies of this work in the British Museum, both, curiously enough, ascribed to 'London.' The Grenville copy, however, has the Newcastle imprint. When the two copies are placed side by side it is at once seen that, although the one has 'Newcastle, Printed by S. B. 1649,' and the other 'London, Printed by J. B. 1649,' they are part of the same edition. The type shows that the Newcastle imprint is the correct one. Who 'J. B.' was it is impossible to say, many publishers with these initials existing in London at this date.

After printing several works in Newcastle during 1650 and 1652 (nothing is known from his press dated 1651), he removed to a house in Hillgate, Gateshead, some time in the latter year. His books printed at this house generally bear the name of William London as bookseller in Newcastle. During 1655 and 1656 the press is silent (as far as we know). In 1657 it issued Ellis Weycoe's 'Publick Sorrow' and in 1658, 'The Quaker's House built upon the Sand,' etc., a copy of which is in the Library of Queen's College, Oxford. In 1659 Bulkley appears to have returned to Newcastle, as appears from the title to Shaw's 'Catalogue of the Hebrew Saints.' But we find in the following year, 1660, a tract of which there is a copy in the Grenville Collection in the British Museum, *viz.*, Ralph Astell's 'Vota non Bella,' which was issued in Gateshead. Mr. Richard Welford, who is now working on a revision of his 'Early Printing in Newcastle-upon-Tyne' (For

Private Circulation. 1895) is unable to account for this. There is no doubt as to the date, firstly, because it is a poem on the Restoration; and, secondly, because the second part of the title-page is arranged as a chronogram giving the same date. Works are in existence with the dates 1661 and 1662, with the Newcastle imprint; but late in 1662 or early in 1663 Bulkley returned to York, doubtless in consequence of the Act of 1662, which added that city to London, Oxford, and Cambridge as the only places in England at which printing was permitted. His new abode was situate in the parish of St. Michael le Belfry, near the Minster. His first print from the new house was a Visitation Sermon of the Archbishop, delivered 19th November, 1662. The imprimatur is dated '16 calend Sept. 1663.' This was printed for Francis Mawborne, the bookseller for whom Bulkley printed several pamphlets during his second residence in York.

In 1664 Bulkley issued 'A list or Catalogue of all the Mayors, etc., of the . . . City of Yorke,' which was the first published work relating to the history and antiquities of the city. The course of Bulkley's life in York was interrupted in 1666 by one (or perhaps two) prosecutions for publishing ballads without the name of the printer. He was indicted at the Assizes at York, in August, 1666, 'pro imprimand libellos, Anglice Ballads, et non opponendo manum suam, contra statutam.' The indictment was ignored by the grand jury. This may be the same affair referred to in the Calendar of State Papers, Dom. '1666. Oct. 15, York. Jon. Mascall to Williamson. Sumner, the messenger,

has arrested Bulkeley and Mawburne, Bulkeley was King's printer at York and Newcastle, imprisoned and plundered for loyalty, gets but a poor living, and is well beloved among the old cavaliers: wonders what the charge against him can be. Mawburne is quiet but weak in business, and would not wilfully disperse any unlicensed book or pamphlet.' It would be interesting to know whether the imprisonment referred to in this document accounts for the period 1654-58, which, as we have said, were blank years as far as the production of his press was concerned.

Francis Mawburne petitioned Lord Arlington on 7th November [?] for release from the custody of the messenger, in which he had been three weeks, 'first about papers alleged against him and then for selling foreign Bibles, from both of which accusations he has cleared himself.' On 24th November there are bonds registered (Cal. State Papers, Dom. 179 : 48) in the joint names of Bulkeley and Mawburne in £200, that they 'shall not print, publish, or sell any unlicensed or seditious books or pamphlets, nor any English Bibles of foreign impressions, nor anything that may be to the disadvantage of the King's printers, or the right of any particular person.' On this a warrant was issued to discharge them from custody. (Cal. State Papers, Dom. vol. 176:49.)

With the exception of this stormy interlude, the course of Bulkley's life and work seems to have progressed quietly enough during the remainder of his life. He died in February, 1680, and was buried in the church of St. Michael le Belfry. His will,

56 STEPHEN BULKLEY, PRINTER.

dated 10th January in that year, and which was proved at York on 1st March, 1679[80], made his eldest daughter, Elizabeth, and his youngest son, John, joint partners in his printing press and letters, and all things belonging thereto. The name of the testator's daughter does not subsequently appear in connection with the press. The business was carried on by his son, John, at a house in Daviegate; but only one or two works are known with his imprints. He seems to have been neither so enterprising nor so successful as his father. He died in December, 1695, and was buried on 31st December, as appears from the registers of St. Helen's Stonegate.

For the facts in connection with Bulkley's residence in York and Newcastle we are principally indebted to Davies's 'Memoir of the York Press,' and to Mr. Richard Welford's pamphlet previously referred to.

H. R. PLOMER.

R. A. PEDDIE.

MATERIALS FOR THE HISTORY OF THE LITHUANIAN BIBLE.¹

THIS translation, of which only two or three fragments are known, is one of the puzzles of international bibliography, made none the less difficult because its literature is found in such languages as Polish, Lithuanian, Russian, and Bohemian. Up to now the most authentic short account of it is found in 'Three Hundred Notable Books' (p. 54) where the fragment now in the British Museum is thus described:

The printing of a Lithuanian Bible was begun by Evan Tyler at Edinburgh about 1660, under the supervision of a delegate from the Lithuanian Calvinistic Synod, Samuel Boguslav Chylinski. In 1662 it had been carried as far as the Psalms, and Chylinski was being allowed £4 a month for his expenses while completing it. At his death in 1668 the Bible was still unfinished, and only three fragments remain, this, which has 176 leaves and ends at Joshua xv, 63, and two longer ones, one at Berlin (originally at Stettin), the other at St. Petersburg (originally at Wilna). Bought in 1893.

The documents I am about to bring forward will throw a somewhat fuller light on the matter. The

¹ A paper read before the Edinburgh Bibliographical Society, 11th January, 1906.

58 MATERIALS FOR THE HISTORY

first is the Oxford Testimonial given in favour of 'Samuel Boguslaus Chylinski' on 15th November, 1659, signed by the Vice-Chancellor and fourteen other Heads of Houses, etc.¹ The essential points, for our purpose, are that Chylinski is said to have lived at Oxford for two years, and 'that during that time he has imployed himself in and hath now accomplished' the work of translating the Bible into Lithuanian. He makes the same statement himself in the tract.

On 12th July, 1661, a Brief for a collection throughout England for the Protestants of Lithuania was sanctioned. It is unusual in form, and was enforced by what was still more unusual at that time, royal letters under the sign manual to some forty of the principal towns, urging that a large sum be contributed. It is expressly mentioned in the Privy Council Register (28th August, 1661, when these letters were sent out), that this should not be made a precedent in the case of any future collection. I cannot account for this eagerness of Charles II and his Council on behalf of their distressed fellow-Christians, except on the supposition that it was thought necessary to reassure the nation on the subject of their Protestant zeal at a time when the Lords were publicly burning the Covenant (22nd May) and the Commons enforcing the Test on their Members. I give a summary of the Brief from the only copy known to exist, British Museum, Luttrell, III (27).

¹ This is found in 'An Account of the Translation of the Bible into the Lithuanian Tongue.' . . . Oxford, H. Hall, 1659. (B.M. 1214. a. 5.)

John de Kraino Krainsky, Minister, Deputy of the National Synod of the Protestant Churches in the great Dukedom of Lithuania, has been sent to England to obtain help for the hundred or more churches oppressed by Moscovites, Tartars, Cossacks, Swedes, etc. A collection is to be made for their aid, and for translating the Bible into Lithuanian which has been translated and about one half of it printed. Sir Richard Browne, Bart., Clerk of the Privy Council, is to print Briefs of this patent at the royal expense and to send one for every church and chapel to the High Sheriffs of all the Counties. A house-to-house and seat-to-seat collection is to be taken up by the Churchwardens and paid through the High Sheriffs to Edward and John Fenn at the Treasury House of the Navy Office in Leadenhall Street. The latter are to send any sum over that necessary for translating and printing the said Bible in London by exchange to Lithuania.

Arrangements were now made for the printing of the Bible—the statement in the Brief that one-half of it was already printed seems to have been only an intelligent anticipation of the same nature as the Oxford certificate that Chylinski had completed the translation two years before—and on 19th December, 1661, Thomas Seaward, merchant, sold to Monsieur Durell and John de Kraino Krainsky, and delivered to Evan Tyler, printer, 200 reams of paper at 10s. per ream, to be paid out of the first moneys collected. He did not, in fact, get his money till 1663, for we learn these facts from his petition to the Privy Council, 25th February, 1662-3. Krainsky seems to have been an energetic man. On his petition, 24th January, 1661-2, Sir Richard Browne was ordered to report as to the collection—and as sufficient funds were

60 MATERIALS FOR THE HISTORY

in hand, the printing seems to have been begun immediately. On the 14th February, 1661-2, the Privy Council gives an order for Evan Tyler, 'Printer of their Bible,' to be paid £50, and Monsieur Durell, Monsieur Scophie, Monsieur Calandrini (Minister of the Dutch Church in London), and Dr. Deodate to be repaid sums of £60, £10, £30, and £10 lent by them. Krainsky was to have £20 for debts incurred in the collection, and an allowance of £4 per month. A like sum was to be paid to his two associates (the translator and another). The name of this associate, who did much of the translation, was Nikatojos Mirovyda, Cand. Theol. He left England in 1667. On 28th February Evan Tyler received another £20, and Krainsky £20 for travelling expenses.

The relations between Chylinski and Krainsky seem speedily to have become strained, for on 21st May, 1662, we find the following note on the books of the Privy Council:

21 May, 1662. Upon hearing of the business betweene the delegate of Lithuania and Chilinsky who hath begun a translation of a Bible in the Lithuanian language, it was ordered that Chilinsky shall speedily send over a copy of all that hee hath printed (being to the end of the Psalms ¹) and all that part hee hath written faire to be revised and corrected by the Churches, and so to be returned to be printed. Also that the said Chilinsky shall speedily transcribe the rest, and so from time to time send it over to the Churches to be corrected by them, and to doe it within 5 or 6 months at the farthest, and to have £4 the Month for his enterpayning in the meane tyme. And

¹ Really to Psalm XL.

Mr. Fenne to pay £6 to Mr. Nathaniel Adams at the desire of the delegate.

This seems to have stopped the work, and to all appearance no more of it was ever printed. On 6th June an additional payment to Tyler of £76 1s. 4d. was sanctioned, making £146 1s. 4d. in all on account of the printing of forty-two reams. The book is a small octavo and printed in minion type like that of the pocket Bibles of the time. About a dozen letters had to be specially cut for the type, and of course the compositors had to be paid at special rates, but even considering all this, the price seems high. At any rate a quarrel seems to have arisen between Krainsky and Tyler, and the latter was ordered to appear before the Council at a week's notice, a proof that he was probably settled in London at the time (13th August, 1662).

The last notice of the matter in the Privy Council Records concerns the payment to Thomas Seaward, merchant, of the £100 due for paper on his lodging certificates from Tyler the printer, and Cesar Calandrini, the minister of the Dutch congregation, that the 42 reams printed and the 158 unprinted have been delivered into the Dutch Library, 25th February, 1662-3. Probably the fragment in Berlin, and the manuscript version at St. Petersburg represent the version sent to Lithuania for revision by Chylinski and the delegates, and never returned.

On an attentive consideration of these facts I think it most likely, first, that the Lithuanian Bible was never completed or published, and second, that

it was printed in London. Considering the commercial relations between England and Scotland, it is *à priori* most unlikely that the English Privy Council should pay for the printing of a book in Edinburgh, not to speak of the statement in the Brief that the Bible was to be printed in London. It would seem to follow that Tyler had a printing office in London simultaneously with his Edinburgh one. This is confirmed by the fact that one, at least, of the Restoration Scots Proclamations, that of 22nd February, 1660-1, exists in two editions, one printed in Scotland with Scots arms, and the other printed in London with English arms, though bearing an Edinburgh imprint alone. A suggestion has been made that Tyler was only in London trying to get orders for work to be executed in Edinburgh, but this seems untenable, in view of Tyler's previous relations with London printing offices, and of the fact that the paper was delivered by an English merchant.

It must, however, be remembered that this period is the one most unstudied in the history of British typography, and that the problems raised by the works printed under Tyler's name are especially intricate. Another point to remark is the fact that of the few proofs which ever got into circulation, some two or three still exist.

ROBERT STEELE.

AN EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY BOOK-ROOM.



It is difficult, in these days of cheap printing and constant issue of literature of all sorts, good, bad, and indifferent, to realize how few books, comparatively speaking, were to be obtained even fifty years ago. The sixpenny reprint was rare, and the shilling one, except in the form of magazines, hardly existed. Perhaps books were prized and guarded more, years ago, than they are now that they are so plentiful, or possibly, paper and binding were tougher in those days than they are in the 'blown together' products of modern times.

A hundred years ago, how hard it was for the man of moderate means to form a library! I do not speak of the man of wealth and taste, who in all ages has been able to procure what he wanted, but only of the man of tolerable education, with more or less of a liking for books, but without much money to 'waste' on such expensive superfluities. For him, a hundred years ago, there were no cheap reprints of popular or standard works, no flimsy but attractive furniture of the bookstall! At that time, his collection might often be contained in one glass-fronted bookcase, Chippendale by style or pedigree, and its contents most likely consisted of

some calf-bound tomes of divinity, travels, or history, enlivened by a few volumes of novels or poetry, bound in boards. It was like the library of Chaucer's clerk, which had its abode on a shelf at his bed-head, 'twenty bookes, clad in black or red.' But the favourite eighteenth-century binding was brown calf, which gave a sombre and solid appearance to the outside of the volumes, not seldom typifying the nature of their contents. A library I knew well in my youth was no bad specimen of the old-fashioned 'book-closet.' It occupied a fair-sized room, with low, raftered ceiling, and mulioned window looking out on woods and fields, the square tower of a noble cathedral rising not far away. The bookcases surrounding it were filled chiefly with the volumes collected by an ancestor who died at the beginning of the nineteenth century, so that it might be said to be a typical, though modest, example of an eighteenth century library. Other books had of course been added at later dates, but the nucleus of the collection was purely eighteenth century, and at the time I knew it best, its most modern books were those of the fifties and sixties of the last century. It was also typically English, for with the exception of a few Greek and Latin classics, and perhaps half a dozen books in French and German, no language but English was represented in it.

In the beginning they were all contained in three bookcases which merit a word of description, for they were excellent specimens of their time, and were probably coeval with their contents. They were all made of dark mahogany, but one

merely consisted of open shelves above a capacious cupboard. The second was a glazed closet, surmounting an old-fashioned bureau; the third, larger and handsomer than either of the former, was also glazed, and consisted of a centre and two wings, the cupboards beneath being furnished with 'roll-back' doors, and the top adorned with scroll-work. As the collection increased, a case of oaken shelves had been fitted in the thickness of the wall near the fireplace. The other shelves which lined the room were not remarkable, save in one instance, a book-case which, though only of painted wood, bore the arms of a certain northern city whose municipality many years ago—whether pressed by poverty or urged by folly, I know not—took upon themselves to sell the furniture of their Mansion House! These shelves were filled with Swift, Fielding, Sterne, and Smollett, dressed in dusky calf as to their exterior, and internally exhibiting yellowed pages and long s's, unattractive to a modern eye. More pleasing was the 'Novelist's Magazine,' its illustrations showing *Clarissa*, *Pamela*, the 'Admirable Miss Byron,' and many others, in 'high heads' and hoops; and Sir Charles and his peers in laced coats, wigs, and swords. Long files of the 'Spectator,' 'Tatler,' 'Rambler,' and 'Annual Register,' were elbowed by still earlier voyages and travels, medicine, law, divinity and history, in many antiquated forms. Were you inclined to travel by sea or by land, Cook, Anson, La Pérouse, Pennant, Camden and Carey were ready to bear you company; to study history? Hume, Rapin, Clarendon, and Adolphus were there to inform you; law?

Coke, of course, Blackett, Tomlinson (1787); medicine? Bartolini's 'Anatomia,' 1686, 'The New Dispensary,' 1765, 'The Practice of London,' 1773, and the 'Medical Register.' Mrs. Mason, 1777, would instruct you in cookery; Gibson in farriery; Kearsley, in heraldry; and if you required a dictionary, Ainsworth, Bailey, and Johnson were at your elbow. Culpepper's 'Herbal,' James on Gardening, 1712, Evelyn's 'Silva,' 1729, Lish's 'Husbandry,' and Lee's 'Botany,' might occupy you out of doors, and Hanger and Hawkins would talk to you of sport.

Did graver thoughts possess your mind, you might study Sherlock on Death, Knox's Sermons, and Jeremy Taylor in the edition of 1674. For antiquities, there were Brand, Bourne, Verstegan ('Decayed Intelligence,' 1605), and Thornton's Antiquarian Cabinet; and for general information, the British Encyclopædia of 1809, and the 'Dictionnaire Historique' of 1789, in nine volumes. The playwrights were Massinger, Ben Jonson, Sheridan, and Shakespeare (Bell's edition, 1774). Among the poets were Pope, Gay, Parnell, Thomson, and Akenside, all in pretty little duodecimo editions, with Uwins' illustrations. Some forgotten by fame there were, as Mrs. Radcliffe, Mrs. Grant Glover, Mason, and Johnson, and perhaps one might add Gessner, as represented by his 'Idylls,' and the 'Death of Abel.' There were others, too, whom fame had never known, for who has heard of Cawdell and Chambers as poets, and who reads Wilson's 'Inconstant Lady'?

Art was represented by Hogarth, 'Prints from

Raphael,' 1761, the Pictorial Bible, some of Bewick's works, and Schiller's 'Drachen and Fridolin,' with Ritsch's illustrations.

Don Quixote, Gil Blas, and the 'Devil on Two Sticks' were among the novels, and I wish I could remember the title of one which perpetuated scandal about Queen Elizabeth, and related the adventures of her unacknowledged daughter! All the above were bound in calf, faded and crumbling, and 'rich with tarnished gold,' or in boards, blue, gray, or brown, paper-labelled, and reduced by years of age and dust to much the same indeterminate hue.

I do not recollect any specially fine bindings or rare editions.

The whole room possessed that pleasant odour peculiar to old libraries, and which is compounded of the various fragrances of 'perished' leather, mouldy paper, and printing ink.

The portrait of their first owner, brave in blue coat, ruffled shirt, powdered hair and queue, looked down upon them, as did the keen, kindly face of a later possessor, together with some miniatures and silhouettes, known and unknown.

On the heavy writing-table was an old-fashioned silver inkstand, which besides the receptacle for ink, had another with a perforated lid to hold the sand used to 'pounce' letters before the invention of blotting-paper. Beside it lay two or three curious old silver seals bearing dates in the seventeenth century.

The ample sofa and roomy chairs were Louis Quinze in style; an ancient cuckoo-clock told the studious hours, and some valuable china was ranged upon the mantelpiece.

68 EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY BOOKROOM.

Many books more recently added were of the 1820's and 1830's, and to about this date belonged Hone's four delightful volumes, a full set of Scott's novels, county histories many, 'mines of delight and treasures of entertainment' to those who study them carefully, as are also the rows of bound magazines which a still later taste had furnished—Cornhill, Blackwood, 'All the Year Round,' etc.—to be found in all libraries of fifty years standing. People bound their magazines in those days, and put them into substantial bindings of brown, black, or green leather (the dishabille, or half-binding most frequently), so that like the Dianas and Ninons of former times, they kept their figures and complexions to extreme old age. Nowadays if magazines are bound at all, it is in 'publishers' covers,' of cloth, gaudy and unsubstantial, which soon come to pieces.

To this date also belonged the 'Drawing-room Scrap-book,' sundry illustrated books meant for the adornment of the parlour table, and a large and miscellaneous collection of poetry, novels, travels, and biographies.

Among the miscellanea was a book containing a large collection of franks, and a scrap-book filled with fine prints, many of which I was told had once, in the fashion of a bygone day, been pasted on the walls of the room. It also held a few mezzotints, soft-ground etchings, water-colours, and a good deal of inferior matter—the usual medley of its time.

That 'spacious closet of good old English literature' has been altered and its contents divided, but much of it remains in its ancient home.

ELEANOR GRAINGE.

GUTENBERG, FUST, SCHOEFFER, AND THE INVENTION OF PRINT- ING.

FOR the past twelve or thirteen years very little has been written in England on the invention of printing. The subject did not greatly interest Mr. Proctor. Dr. Hessels, since he wrote his 'Haarlem the Birthplace of Printing, not Mentz,' in 1887, has preserved a silence, which fortunately will soon be broken, both in the paper which he is to read before the Bibliographical Society next month, and in the revised version of his article on typography for the new edition of the 'Encyclopaedia Britannica.' Lastly, Mr. Gordon Duff, after an admirable summary of the then existing evidence in his 'Early Printed Books' in 1893, has concentrated himself on the history of the press in our own country, interesting himself in foreign printing for the most part only in so far as it throws light on this. As against this English silence there has been a considerable revival of discussion and investigation in Germany, to which the foundation of the Gutenberg Gesellschaft in 1901 has powerfully contributed. The indifference of our English bibliographers to these researches and to the new evidence which has been brought to light is not very creditable. It was with a feeling approaching to shame

that I found the other day that the leaves of the British Museum copy of the first publication of the Gutenberg Society had never been opened. My own acquaintance with the recent German literature of the subject is far less minute than I could wish, for I read German somewhat slowly and timorously, an unconventional confession which I feel bound in honour to make, lest haply I do injustice in what follows to the arguments of any of the able writers with whose monographs I have struggled. But the new evidence which they have brought to light has obliged me to modify my own views in some important respects, and at the same time has suggested a theory as to the moment of the quarrel between Gutenberg on the one hand and Fust and Schoeffer on the other, which is perhaps worth paper and print.

Historians of the invention of printing have two prizes in their bestowal, the first for a competition vague, elusive, never likely to be definitely settled, that for the earliest piece of printing with movable types; the second for an honour much more limited and precise, the production of the first large, handsomely-printed book. Twenty years ago there was a little flutter of excitement over the claims to this second distinction put forward on behalf of the Latin Bible with 36 lines to a column, discovered in the eighteenth century by Schelhorn, and sometimes called the Bamberg Bible, because the type with which it is printed was used in 1461 by Albrecht Pfister at Bamberg. It was conclusively shown, however, by Dr. Dziatzko that this cannot have been the first Bible printed, since (with the

possible exception of the first five or six leaves) its text is taken from that of the other great Latin Bible, with 42 to a column as its normal number of lines, which has long been known as the Mazarine Bible, because the copy of it which first attracted attention was that in the Mazarine Library at Paris. This 42-line Bible (to call it by the name by which it is now best known) is now generally recognized as the first large, handsomely-printed book, and to the man or men who produced it belongs the honour of having brought printing with movable types out of the experimental stage into the position of a practical art, fraught with immense possibilities.

All the recent English writers who have concerned themselves with the history of printing, Blades, Hessels, Duff, Proctor, have been professed disciples of Henry Bradshaw, the man whose natural-history method of investigation has put the study on a new footing, and, when applied by Proctor, with equal industry and genius, yielded such marvellous results. It is of the essence of this method to start with a solid indisputable fact, to make this fact yield the utmost possible amount of evidence, and to refuse to take any step for which evidence cannot be produced. Where evidence fails we may introduce hypothesis if we choose; but where a single hypothetical link is introduced, the whole chain from this point becomes hypothetical, and should be marked as such.

Now up to within the last few years the one solid fact from which it was possible to start an investigation into the history of printing was that in the autumn of the year 1454 and the spring of

1455 the art of printing with movable types was used to print two sets of Indulgences, an Indulgence being a certificate that certain spiritual privileges had been granted in return for a contribution of alms to some charitable purpose, in this case the war carried on by the King of Cyprus against the Turks. One of these Indulgences consists of 31 lines of print, the other of 30. The text of both is in a small gothic fount, but in each case a few words are printed in a much larger type. In both, moreover, there are small ornamental capitals, V or U, and two forms of M.

These Indulgences, printed in 1454 and 1455, are the earliest dated specimens of printing which have come down to us. Manuscript copies filled in with dates in the summer months of 1454 are in existence; but in the autumn of that year, the Proctor-General of the King of Cyprus or his agents, who were raising money in this way, must have heard of the new art of printing, and have seen the advantages which it offered for the multiplication of a short document of which a large number of copies were required.

Both these two editions of the Indulgence exist in several different states or issues. The following account of them is summarized from that given by Dr. Hessels in his 'Gutenberg: was he the Inventor of Printing?' (1882), as the result of unwearying travel and personal research. It should be stated that the papal commission to the Pardoners ceased on the 1st of May, 1455, and that therefore no copies could be issued (I try hard to avoid the use of the word 'sold'!) after 30th April.

& THE INVENTION OF PRINTING. 73

31-LINE INDULGENCE. Capitals (initials): V and two varieties of M.

- (a) and (b). Both with printed date Mccccliuii, no copies known to have been issued; perhaps 'experiments of the printer to accommodate the Pardoner with the necessary blank space for filling in the names and date.' (Hessels.)
- (c) Printed date Mccccliuii.
Copies issued at Erfurt, 15th November; Mainz, 31st December; Eynbeck, 12th January; Lüneburg, 27th January; Lüneburg, 28th January; Copenhagen, 29th April; Hildesheim, 30th April.
- (d) Printed date Mcccclv.
Copies issued at Würzburg, 7th March; Nuremberg, 24th March; Erfurt, 28th March; Würzburg, 13th April; Constance, 21st April; Würzburg, 29th April; Göttingen, 29th April.

Unused copies of this edition discovered at Brunswick and Halberstadt are well accounted for by Dr. Hessels as copies which remained in the Pardoners' hands at these places on the lapsing of their commission on 30th April, 1455, and which thus were ultimately sold to binders of these places as waste.

30-LINE INDULGENCE. Capitals (initials): U and two varieties of M.

- (a) Printed date Mccccliij.
Copy issued at Cologne, 27th February, 1455, an additional stroke having been added to the date by pen.
- (b) Printed date Mcccclquīto.
Copies issued at Werla in Westphalia, 11th April; at Neuss near Düsseldorf, 29th April. This latter is in the British Museum.

74 GUTENBERG, FUST, SCHOEFFER,

(c) Printed date Mccccquīto.

Copies issued at Hildesheim, 22nd February;
Brunswick, 24th April.

The distinguishing marks of these different issues (other than their dates, here given,) will be found duly set forth by Dr. Hessels. The reason for summarizing from him his list of the places of issue will be seen later on.

Of these Indulgences Mr. Gordon Duff wrote in his 'Early Printed Books':

These two sets are unmistakably the work of two different printers, one of whom may well have been Peter Schoeffer, since we find the initial letters which are used in the thirty-line editions used again in an Indulgence of 1489, certainly printed by him. Who, then, was the printer of the other set? He is generally said to have been John Gutenberg; and though we have no proof of this, or indeed of Gutenberg's having printed any book at all, there is a strong weight of circumstantial evidence in his favour.

When Mr. Duff thus writes, 'these two sets are unmistakably the work of two different printers,' he has at his back what we may call one of the canons of the natural-history method of investigating the history of printing, viz., that pieces of printing in different types must not be assigned to the same printer unless a reason for so assigning them can be shown. In the absence of any evidence to the contrary we have no ground for believing that a printer would put himself to the trouble of cutting fresh types to print a document which he had already set up and was continuing to print in the original form. On

the other hand, it must be remembered that this purely *à priori* reasoning would be knocked down at once by any positive evidence that the same printer, as a fact, printed both sets; and would be considerably weakened even by the suggestion of a good special reason why he should have done so.

Having interjected this comment, we may now go on to ask with Mr. Duff, 'What do we know about John Gutenberg, the presumed printer of the first dated specimen of printing?' and to inquire generally as to what light documentary evidence throws on the question of the invention. As in the case of Chaucer and other mediaeval personages of whom no literary contemporary has had the kindness to leave us biographical notes, our information is all derived from the more or less accidental preservation of records of payments and legal documents. With the aid of these we are able to piece out a fairly consecutive outline of Gutenberg's life.¹

Johann Gutenberg was a native of Mainz, where he appears to have been born about 1400. His father's name was Gänzfleisch (*i.e.* Gooseflesh); but Johann preferred the more euphonious appellation of his mother's family, and called himself Gutenberg. When the patrician party to which his parents belonged was driven out of Mainz in 1420, Gutenberg took refuge at Strassburg, and appears to have occupied himself there with mechanical

¹ Dr. Dziatzko's account of Gutenberg is given in Hef. 8 of his 'Sammlung Bibliothekswissenschaftlicher Arbeiten' under the title, 'Was wissen wir von dem Leben und der Person Joh. Gutenberg?'

inventions connected with looking-glasses and polishing stones. In 1438 he entered into a partnership with two brothers, named Heilmann, and a third person, named Andreas Dritzehn, for developing some secret invention. Dritzehn died almost at once, and the following year Gutenberg successfully resisted a claim put forward by Dritzehn's heir to be admitted to the secret. In the course of the trial one witness deposed that on the death of Andreas Dritzehn Gutenberg desired his brother Claus 'that he should not show to anyone the press which he had under his care'; but should 'go to the press and open this by means of the two little buttons, whereby the pieces would fall asunder. He should thereupon put those pieces in or on the press, after which nobody could see or comprehend anything.' According to another witness, Gutenberg 'had sent his servant to fetch all the forms, and they were taken asunder before his eyes.' Moreover, a third witness, 'Hans Dünne the goldsmith,' deposed that 'three years ago or thereabouts he had earned from Gutenberg nearly 100 guilden merely for that which belonged to printing.'¹ It can thus hardly be doubted that Gutenberg was already in 1438 experimenting with printing, and it may be presumed that any secret invention about this date would have included the idea of movable types.

In 1441 and 1442 we find Gutenberg borrowing money, after the manner of inventors. Soon after

¹ Our quotations are from the transcript and translation given by Dr. Hessels in his 'Gutenberg,' pp. 34-57, and the technical terms, 'presse,' 'forme,' 'trucken,' admit of no other renderings.

this he returned to Mainz and borrowed money there also. Finally, somewhere about August, 1450, a goldsmith of Mainz, Johann Fust, advanced him 800 guilders to enable him to print books, and about December, 1452, a further sum of the same amount. On these loans Gutenberg was to pay interest, but this he failed to do, and in November, 1455, we find Fust,¹ in the presence of witnesses, taking an oath before a notary, as to the correctness of his claim in an action which he had brought for the return of the 1,600 guilders with the arrears of interest. In this suit Peter Schoeffer was a witness on the side of Fust, while mention is made of two servants of Gutenberg, Heinrich Keffer, who afterwards worked with Sensenschmid, the first printer at Nuremberg, and Bertolf von Hanau, who has been identified with Bertold Ruppel, the first printer at Basel. The oath which Fust took seems to have been that imposed on a successful plaintiff as a condition of obtaining judgement for the amount of his claim. There thus appears to be no doubt that Gutenberg was condemned to pay the 1,600 guilders with arrears of interest, and it has usually been taken for granted that Fust in this manner obtained possession of all Gutenberg's plant and stock.

Some nine months after Fust had, as we should say, made his affidavit, Heinrich Cremer, vicar of the collegiate church at Mainz, finished rubricating and binding a copy of the 42-line Bible, now in the

¹ The text is printed with a facsimile by Dr. Dziatzko: 'Beiträge zur Gutenbergfrage. Mit einem Lichtdruck-facsimile des Helmaspergschen Notariatsinstrumentes vom 6. November, 1455, nach dem Original der K. Universitäts-Bibliothek zu Göttingen.'

78 GUTENBERG, FUST, SCHOEFFER,

Bibliothèque Nationale at Paris. Little thinking of how great a service he was thereby rendering to posterity, the good man noted at the end of each volume the exact day on which he finished his work. The date in the first is 24th August, 1456; that in the second, which is slightly shorter, nine days earlier, August 15th. He may have begun rubricating these two volumes within a few days of their completion, or after an interval of a few or many weeks or months. He may have worked quickly or slowly. All that we know is that within nine months of Fust winning his case against Gutenberg, at least this one copy of the 42-line Bible was in existence, rubricated and bound.

The 42-line Bible does not stand alone. The type in which it is printed is identical with the larger of the two types used in the 30-line Indulgences, printed in the autumn of 1454 and spring of 1455. The following books and documents are also printed in the same type :

1. An edition of the Latin grammar of Aelius Donatus, with 24, 25, or 26 lines to a page.
2. Another Edition with 32 lines to a page.
3. Another Edition with 33 lines to a page.
4. A Cantica ad Matutinas, obviously part of a liturgical Psalter, of which one leaf survives, in the Bibliothèque Nationale.

Over against this Bible, Indulgence, and three editions of Donatus we have, in curious parallelism, the Bible with 36 lines to the column already mentioned as an unsuccessful competitor against the 42-line Bible for the honour of being the first

large printed book; the Indulgences of 31 lines printed in the autumn of 1454 and spring of 1455, and three editions of the grammar of Donatus. Just as the large type of the 30-line Indulgence is identical with that of the 42-line Bible, so the large type of the 31-line Indulgence is identical with that of the 36-line Bible, and the two sets of books, Indulgences, Bibles, Donatuses, pair off exactly. Against the *Cantica ad Matutinas* there is no large work in the 36-line Bible type which can be set. On the other hand, there are three quite small works in this type, all of the nature of almanacs, entitled respectively, (i) 'Manung widder die Durke,' belonging astronomically to the year 1455; (ii) 'Conjunctiones et Oppositiones solis et lunae,' belonging to 1457; (iii) 'Der Cisianus zu dutsche,' a general almanac which cannot be appropriated to any particular year, though an ill-advised attempt has been made to do so.

Also in this type are nine popular books, all but two of which are illustrated. Dates and names of place and printer in some of these books entitle us to assign them all to the press of Albrecht Pfister at Bamberg in or about 1461 and 1462. They have no connection with the invention of printing, except in so far as they enable a claim to be entered on Pfister's behalf to the earlier books, or (as an alternative) prove that the printer of these handed over his type to Pfister.

The battle rages as to the typographical authorship of the two parallel sets of Indulgences, Bibles, and Donatuses, which we must distribute between Gutenberg on the one hand, and the firm of Fust

on the other, or else assign to some hypothetical printer of whom nothing has ever been heard.

The after-history of Gutenberg is that he may have printed anonymously in 1460 a *Catholicon* or Latin Dictionary by a thirteenth-century Dominican of Genoa, named Balbus, and some smaller works in the same type. Then in 1465 he became a pensioner at the Court of the Archbishop of Mainz, and three years later he died.

So much of the after-history of the firm of Fust as we need at this moment is, that in 1457 Fust's name in conjunction with Schoeffer's is found in the colophon of the first dated and signed book, a liturgical psalter, with fine capitals, printed in red and blue, published at Mainz in August, 1457, and that they issued several other fine books in conjunction during the next nine years. In 1466 Fust died, and Schoeffer, to whom he had given his daughter, Christina Fust, in marriage, carried on the business successfully for many years on his own account.

All the facts already narrated have long been known, and may be found, with many other details; in Dr. Hessels' book on Gutenberg, published in 1882. Dr. Hessels also pointed out that one of the capitals used in the 30-line Indulgences turns up as late as 1489 in another Indulgence printed in that year by Schoeffer; also that there exists in the Bibliothèque Nationale a fragment of a 35-line Donatus, printed in the 42-line Bible type in conjunction with the coloured capitals of the Psalter of 1457, and that this has the colophon 'per Petrum de Gernssheym in urbe Moguntina cum suis capita-

libus absque calami exaratione effigiatus,' 'Gernsheym' being Schoeffer's birthplace. Because this Donatus contains Schoeffer's name without Fust's, foreign bibliographers have placed it after Fust's death. Thus, the description of it in the 'Notice des Objets Exposés' of the Bibliothèque Nationale reads:

Fragment de Donat. *Mayence, impr. par Pierre (Schoeffer) de Gernsheym.* In fol. sur vélin.

Ce fragment consiste en 4 feuillets, plus le quart d'un 5^e et d'un 6^e.—Cette édition de Donat a été imprimée par Schoeffer postérieurement, sans doute, à 1466 (époque de la mort de Fust), dont le nom ne figure pas dans la souscription, avec les caractères de la Bible Mazarine et les initiales en bois du Psautier de 1457.

Dr. Hessels, however, contended that it was 'altogether more consonant to method' to place the Donatus in 1456 with the Bible printed in the same type. It may be noted, moreover, that a Donatus, throughout the early history of printing, was frequently used for typographical experiments and advertisements. It thus seems reasonable to believe that if Schoeffer wished to try the effect of his coloured capitals before using them for a large book he may very well have put them into a Donatus, whereas after they had been tried and abandoned (save in antiquarian reprints of the Psalter) as too troublesome, their sudden reappearance in a school-book, in conjunction with a Bible-type which had disappeared since 1456, is at once incongruous and inexplicable.

The conclusion, therefore, at which Dr. Hessels

arrived (page 167) was, that 'in 1454 we have at least two rival printers at work in Mentz: (1) the printer of the 31-line Indulgence, whose name I cannot give, but who may have been Gutenberg, subsidized by Johann Fust; (2) the printer of the 30-line Indulgence, whom we may safely call Peter (Schoeffer) de Gernssheym.'

Four pages later Dr. Hessels gives another summary of the evidence on the point, which also deserves quotation, because it was apparently approved by Mr. Bradshaw, and is taken over by Mr. Duff.

I have shown above that one of the initials of the 30-line Indulgence is found in 1489 in Schoeffer's Office. The Church-type of the same Indulgence links on (in spite of the different capital P) to the anonymous 42-line Bible of 1456. This Bible links on to the 35-line Donatus, which is in the same type, and has Schoeffer's name and his coloured capitals. This again brings us to the Psalter which Joh. Fust and Peter Schoeffer published together on the 14th August, 1457, at Mentz, their first (dated) book, with their name and the capitals of the Donatus.

Bibliographically this seems to me as sound an argument as the heart of man can desire. If it were applied to a group of books twenty years later, it can hardly be doubted that everyone would accept it at once. But in 1454 we have some right to ask where a printer came from, and Schoeffer here seems to have come from nowhere in particular. Moreover, and this is an argument to which I shall have to recur, despite the canon that, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, two editions of the same

work in two different types oblige us to assume two different printers, I feel the greatest difficulty in believing that in the autumn of 1454 there were two men living in Mainz, both capable of producing, within a few weeks of each other, a fount of small type of the excellence of those used in the two sets of Indulgences. Recent writers on the subject seem to me curiously silent on the greatness of the advance which these small types show on the clumsy Bible types of the other pieces of printing of the period. They must have required far more skill in cutting, casting and manipulating, and though it was some years before such small types were again used, they demonstrated commercial possibilities in the new art which the Bible-types still left doubtful. The difficulty in producing for the first time two such types seems to me a consideration which has to be taken into account before applying mechanically the canon 'different types, different printers,' though, subject to an explanation, I believe that this canon may still hold good.

The first of the German points to which I have to draw attention is that Dr. Dziatzko, in criticizing Dr. Hessels' argument, offered an ingenious theory as to the reasons for there being two sets of types used in the Indulgences, namely, that they were commissioned by two different sets of Pardoners, the 31-line Indulgence for use in the ecclesiastical province of Mainz, the 30-line Indulgence for use in the ecclesiastical province of Cologne. In order to prevent confusion or fraud between the rival bands of Pardoners, it was insisted, so it is suggested,

that the Indulgences should be printed in different types, and thus the Germans are free to attribute them both to Gutenberg.

As to the appearance of a capital M from the 30-line Indulgence in an Indulgence printed by Schoeffer in 1489, it may be said that if all Gutenberg's types were seized by Fust in consequence of the lawsuit decided at the end of 1455, there is no difficulty in believing that this capital M changed hands with the rest of them. The same argument applies to the use of the 42-line Bible type in conjunction with the coloured capitals in Schoeffer's undated 'Donatus.' As long as this was printed after the lawsuit was decided, on the supposition that the type was seized by Fust, there is no difficulty in accounting for its appearance in Schoeffer's possession, whether as Fust's ally and partner-elect, or as Fust's heir.

To suppose that in order to make the two sets of Indulgences look different, the printer was put to the trouble of making a special fount of type, when they could surely have been differentiated much more easily in many other ways, is not convincing, though the suggestion that they were required for use in different provinces offers a welcome explanation of the Indulgences being ordered in two batches. The explanation of the capital M and 42-line Bible-type being found in Schoeffer's hands by the theory that Fust seized them from Gutenberg is at least a possible hypothesis, but leaves it still to be proved that the type was ever in Gutenberg's possession.

Recent German investigations into what may be

& THE INVENTION OF PRINTING. 85

called the inner history of the 42-line Bible, more especially the admirable monograph by Dr. Paul Schwenke reviewed by Mr. Proctor, at the time of its appearance, in 'The Library' for January, 1901, seem to me to offer new evidence which works in directly the opposite direction to the desires of Dr. Schwenke himself and his compatriots. It has been proved, with an industry and acumen beyond all praise, that the Bible was set up on six different presses, which must have necessitated premises of some size and the services probably of at least a dozen workmen. It has been proved also that paper was ordered in large quantities, and that perhaps as many as thirty copies were printed on vellum. The gifts for organization and management which pushing so large a work successfully through the press must have entailed, are held up to our admiration. But the more stress is laid on the greatness of the achievement of printing for the first time a book of the size of the Bible, the more surely we must ask ourselves, If Gutenberg possessed these gifts, how was it to Fust's advantage to quarrel with him? If Gutenberg, moreover, was an alert, capable man, able to organize and manage a business, how did he come to allow himself to be ruined by Fust at what, on the German hypothesis, was the very moment of success? The German plea that there was not time enough for the Bible to be begun and printed off by Fust between November, 1455 and August, 1456, even if we suppose Heinrich Cremer to have been exceptionally quick over the rubricating and binding, is surely sound. Either, therefore, the Bible must have been com-

pletely finished before November, 1455, or very considerable progress must have been made with it before it was seized, according to hypothesis, by Fust in part payment for his claim. In the former case Gutenberg would have had the whole edition (one hundred and eighty copies on paper and thirty on vellum, Dr. Schwenke conjectures) at his disposal available for raising money. In the latter case he would at least have had the sheets of a great part of the book. Was there no other moneylender in Mainz except Fust, that Gutenberg, if he had had this property in his possession, could not have raised enough money on it to prevent the seizure of his stock and types?

The newest German discoveries, while they substantially further Gutenberg's claim to be the first to have used movable types, once more seem to me to militate against his having printed the 42-line Bible. For the moment we may postpone discussion of them, and merely note that a fragment of an Astronomical Almanac has been found at Wiesbaden, printed in the type of the 36-line Bible, and that this Almanac can only relate to the year 1448, and must therefore have been printed in the autumn of 1447, *i.e.*, seven years before the Mainz Indulgences which have hitherto been our starting-point. Besides the Almanac a fragment has since been found of a Poem on the Last Judgement, for which also a very early date is claimed, but as this cannot be assigned to any particular year it is of much less importance than the Almanac of 1448. The Almanac, indeed, unless its date can be overthrown, is a new landmark in the history of printing, the

value of which can hardly be over-estimated. It is true that, as Mr. Duff put it, Fust's language about his loans had already shown that they 'were advanced in the first instance towards assisting a work the method of which was understood,' and we were therefore 'justified in considering that by [1450] Gutenberg had mastered the principles of the art of printing.' In the Almanac, however, we have actual demonstration of the fact in the shape of a piece of printing which Gutenberg could have taken in his hand to Fust when applying to him for a loan.

That the Almanac, if printed in 1447, must have been the work of Gutenberg, hardly needs demonstration. It comes as a link between the lawsuit of 1439, and the transactions with Fust in 1450, and there is no trace in records or type of any other printer having been at work in Germany at this time.

If the Almanac is accepted as the work of Gutenberg before 1450, there can no longer be any hesitation in ascribing to him the ownership of the printing-office at Mainz from which proceeded the Donatuses and the 31-line Indulgence, the only pieces of printing (in addition to the Almanac and Poem on the Last Judgement) which we are entitled to ascribe to an earlier date than the 42-line Bible. But we are no whit nearer to any connection between Gutenberg and that Bible, or anything else printed in the same type, except on the theory which I have already advocated, that when compared with any previous pieces of printing, the resemblance between the two Indulgences is so much

more striking than their difference that it is much easier to believe in one author of them both than in two. On this theory the Germans ascribe both Indulgences to Gutenberg. On this theory I should assign both Indulgences to Schoeffer, the first executed in his traditional capacity as Gutenberg's servant, the second on his own behalf.

The entirely hypothetical character of this solution of the problem is, of course, obvious. But it is no more hypothetical than that seizure of Gutenberg's stock by Fust in consequence of the suit of 1455, without which Gutenberg's connection with the 42-line Bible is demonstrably impossible. It seems to me, moreover, to possess the only recommendation which an hypothesis can claim as long as it remains hypothetical, that of explaining, instead of contradicting, the known facts, and being in general accordance with the ordinary characteristics of human nature.

Because Gutenberg is the most likely candidate for the honour of having first demonstrated the possibility of printing with movable types, it does not follow that he was a good man of business, that he had any organizing power, or was even capable of sticking to his work. We know that he was a frequent borrower. We know now also that he possessed in 1447 sufficient skill and energy to do a small piece of printing, such as the Almanac, and there is no evidence that any further progress was made until 1454. It is highly probable indeed that Gutenberg was as far advanced in 1438 as he was in 1447; for if the art which is mentioned in the Dritzehn lawsuit as to be used on the occasion of

a pilgrimage to Aix-la-Chapelle, was that of printing, it would probably be some popular devotional poem, or other catchpenny broadside, which it was intended to sell to the pilgrims. As long as printing was confined to clumsy editions of almanacs and single poems, or even of Donatuses. its commercial possibilities were undeveloped. The possibilities were there, and they were obvious enough to borrow money on; but if Gutenberg, while talking of large works, could produce nothing more than these trifles during seven, or seventeen, years, it is easy to understand that Fust, after four years' trial of him, may have been anxious only to get his money back and invest it with some one more energetic.

Now one of the things for which the historian of printing has to account is the strong claim made on behalf both of Fust and of Schoeffer to the invention of Printing, or at least to a very important share in it. The colophon, which Johann Schoeffer in 1515 added to the 'Compendium de Origine regum et gentis Francorum' of Johann Trithem cannot be acquitted of either of the two crimes, *suppressio veri* and *suggestio falsi*. It suppresses the very name Gutenberg, it suggests an initiative on the part of Fust greater than we can believe that he really took; but it reads as if it bore a distinct relation to the facts of the case, and as if every word in it had been carefully chosen. This is what it says, the skilfulness of our printers of the Chiswick Press, to whom we express our thanks, enabling us to show the colophon overpage in a very close reproduction of its original form :

¶ IMPRESSVM ET COMPLETVM EST PRESENS

chronicarum opus anno dñi. M.D.XV. in uigilia Margarete uirginis. In nobili famosaq; urbe Moguntina, huius artis impressorie inuentrice prima. Per IOANNEM Schöffer, nepotē quoddā honesti uiri IOANNIS fusth

cius Moguntin, memorate artis primarij auctoris

Qui tandē imprimendi artē proprio ingenio excogitare speculariq; cœpit aſo dñice natiuitatis

MCCCC.L. indiſſiōe XIII. Regnante illu

ſtriſſimo Ro. imperatore FREDERICO

III. Preſidente ſanctæ Moguntinæ ſedi

Reuerēdiſſimo in chrō prē domino

THEODERICO pincerna de Er-

pach pſcipe electore Anno aut

M.CCCC.LII. perfecit dedu-

xitq; eā (diuina fauente gra-

tia) in opus imprimēdi

(Opera tñ ac multis

neceſſariis ad-

uentionibus

PETRI

Schöffer de

Gernshei mini-

ſtri ſuiq; filij adopti-

ui) Cui etiam filiam ſuam

CHRISTINAM fuſthiñ p

digna laborū multarūq; adinuē-

tionū remuneratiōe nuptui dedit. Re-

tinerūt aut hij duo iā pſenominati IOANNES

fuſth & PETRVS Schöffer hāc artem i ſecreto (omni-

bus miniſtris ac familiaribus eorū, ne illā quomodo mani-

feſtarēt, iureiurādo aſtriſſis) Quo tandē de aſo dñi MCCCC

LXII p eoſdem familiares i diuerſas terras puincias diuulgata

haud parum ſumpſit ſcrementum.*

CVM GRATIA ET PRIVILEGIO CAESAREE MAIE-

ſtatis iuſſu & ipenſis honeſti IOANNIS Haſelpſerg ex Aia maiore

Conſtantiēſi dioceſis.*

It is not only the hour-glass or double-triangle form in which this colophon is cast that is artificial, though considerable skill must have been needed to

& THE INVENTION OF PRINTING. 91

get the name of Peter Schoeffer exactly in the middle. It is obvious that the whole thing is a work of art. The dates 1450 and 1452 correspond to those of the two loans made by Fust to Gutenberg, on the occasion of each of which the speculative goldsmith no doubt turned his 'proper wit' more anxiously to the subject of printing. 1462 is the date of the sack of Mainz, and consequent dispersal of many of the printers. The word 'inventor' is skilfully reserved for the city of Mainz. Fust is called 'huius artis primarius auctor,' where 'primarius' suggests priority in time and could be defended as referring only to eminence. The position assigned to Schoeffer, in relation to the capitalist is that of the clever and inventive assistant, the word 'adinuentionibus' recalling the 'adinuentione' of the colophon to the Psalter of 1457, with the same uncertainty in each case as to whether it was intended to mean 'invention' or 'additional invention.' The colophon is disingenuous and discreditable, but it was issued when the facts were too recent for it to be easily swept away as a mere tissue of lies without any relation to the truth.

This is still more the case with the claims which Schoeffer put forward in two of his books, when Fust and Gutenberg were both new in their graves.

In Schoeffer's editions of the Institutions of Justinian of 1468 and 1472, and also in his Decretals of 1473, we find the following extraordinarily crabbed verses by the corrector, Master Francis:

Scema tabernaculi moises salomon quoque templi
Haut propter ingenuos perficiunt dedalos

Sic decus ecclesie maius maior salomone
 Jam renouans, renouat beselehet et hyram.
 Hos dedit eximios sculpendi in arte magistros
 Cui placet en mactos arte sagire viros.
 Quos genuit ambos vrbs moguntina iohannes
 Librorum insignes protocaragmaticos.
 Cum quibus optatum petrus venit ad poliandrum
 Cursu posterior introeundo prior.
 Quippe quibus prestat sculpendi lege sagitus
 A solo dante lumen et ingenium.
 Natio queque suum poterit reperire caragma
 Secum. nempe stilo preminet omnigeno.
 Credere difficile est doctores quam preciosa
 Pendat mercede scripta recorrigere.
 Orthosintheticum cuius sintagma per orbem
 Fulget franciscum presto magistrum habet.
 Me quoque devinxit illi non vile tragema
 Publica sed comoda, et terrigenum columen.
 Sic votiuam exscobere falsis moliantur ydeam
 Qui sintagma regunt et protocaragma legunt.
 Aureola indubie premiaret eos logotheca
 Quippe libris cathedras mille suberudiunt.

In order that the classical reader may not be too shocked at these lines, it may be noted that mediaeval Latin versifiers frequently disregarded quantity altogether, scanning only by syllables. The recourse to Greek words is also not peculiar to Master Francis. The gist of those of his crabbed verses which concern us is that like as God raised up builders of the Temple so to renew the glory of the church, so He has raised up new temple-builders, distinguished masters in the art of engraving, two Johns, both of them born at Mainz, famous first-founders of books, with whom a Peter came to the desired sepulchre, later in the race, but earlier in

entering in, seeing that he excels them, being filled with the principle of engraving by the only giver of light and wit.

The two Johns, distinguished masters in the art of engraving, are of course Johann Gutenberg and Johann Fust, the Peter is Peter Schoeffer, and it is distinctly claimed for him that, like as S. Peter, though he reached the sepulchre after S. John, was yet the first to enter in, so Peter Schoeffer, by his divinely given skill in engraving, entered into the mysteries of printing before Gutenberg and Fust. The claim here put forward on behalf of Schoeffer was advanced in 1468, some years after he had laid aside his decorative capitals; it is impossible therefore to make the verses refer exclusively to the skill shown in these. There is a general claim that Schoeffer, by his skill in engraving, penetrated the mystery of printing, at which Gutenberg and Fust were also aiming, earlier than either of them.

In face of this fairly definite claim, made as early as 1468, I do not think that there is anything unreasonable in imagining that it may have been Schoeffer who, when the Pardoners were at Mainz in the autumn of 1454, produced, by his skill in engraving, a printed Indulgence which solved for the first time the problem of small type, while using with this small type a little of the larger fount which Gutenberg already possessed. If Schoeffer was at this time in Gutenberg's employment, the order to print this Indulgence for distribution in the province of Mainz would of course be given to Gutenberg, and the type would be his property.

By the autumn of 1454, however, about the same period had elapsed since Fust's second loan to Gutenberg as had separated the second from the first, and the poor inventor may have again come to the end of his resources. In any case, the man who cut the small type had performed a technical feat far greater than any yet accomplished; and if this man was Schoeffer, Fust may well have thought that the assistant was a better craftsman than his master. If Schoeffer thought so too, and left Gutenberg's service, the Pardoners about to start on their rounds in the province of Cologne may well have applied to him, if they knew the share which he had played in producing the previous Indulgence. With Fust's money a workshop with six presses could be quickly equipped, and between November, 1454, and the summer of 1456, there would be ample time, if six presses were devoted to it, to print a Bible.¹

Whether this hypothesis as to Schoeffer's authorship of both Indulgences be regarded as possible or not, it seems to me unreasonable to suppose that Fust waited till after the decision of his lawsuit before setting up a printing business of his own. It is at least as likely that as soon as he saw that he could not get what he wanted from Gutenberg, he

¹ In an article in the 'Booklovers' Magazine' for 1905 I have shown that the edition of Valerius Maximus printed by Schoeffer in 1471 was also worked simultaneously on six different presses, and bears traces of a similar change of mind as to the number of copies to be printed. But of course this, like Dr. Hessels' arguments from types found in Schoeffer's possession, is circumvented by the hypothesis that everything which had been Gutenberg's became Fust's after 1455.

looked about for someone to take his place, and that the lawsuit was only an incident in a competition which had already begun. If we had Gutenberg's affidavit as well as Fust's, much more light would probably be thrown on the case. But as far as can be gathered there was nothing in the terms of the loan advanced by Fust which either obliged Gutenberg to impart to Fust any secret, or prevented Fust from using to his own advantage any knowledge of which he became possessed in the course of his intercourse with Gutenberg.

After the lawsuit of 1455 it seems probable that Gutenberg found an ally in Pfister who helped him to push through the 36-line Bible for which the 42-line edition was used as 'copy.' As Pfister is subsequently found using the type alone, it may be presumed that he also found Gutenberg a person who had to be bought out, or otherwise got rid of. If Gutenberg was the printer of the Catholicon of 1460, he seems to have had a third experience of the same kind in connection with a Dr. Homery.

Substantially, it seems to me, that Dr. Hessels' distribution of the Mainz incunabula about which he wrote in 1882, is only confirmed by the subsequent German investigations. The longer the period during which Gutenberg can be shown to have been occupying himself with printing petty broadsheets in the 36-line Bible type, the more improbable it is that he should suddenly start printing a great Bible in a different type, make elaborate changes in this type, whereas he had been content with the old one for many years, and start printing on six different presses. By taking back the

earliest date which we can connect with a printed document nearly seven years, the recent discoveries diminish Gutenberg's claim on one side, while by their demonstration of the energy and ample resources with which the Bible was pushed on, they diminish it no less on the other. The question cannot be asked too often, if Gutenberg was a man of such business energy why should Fust have withdrawn his support? I cannot myself help asking also whether if Gutenberg in the autumn of 1454 made the remarkable advance over his previous type shown in the 31-line Indulgence, this also would not have made Fust hold his hand?

One of the lessons which we are slowly learning is that there was no miracle in the invention of printing. We have wondered how it attained perfection at the moment that it came into existence, just as foolishly as the Fellows of the Royal Society wondered why the introduction of a live fish into a full bowl of water should not cause the water to overflow. We know what happened when the live fish was procured, and now that we are studying the oldest pieces of printing more assiduously than before we find the asserted perfection is not there, only experiments and improvements, and gradual triumph over difficulties. In such a process it is not likely that all the steps were made by one man. Schoeffer and his son claimed that it was to him that some important improvement was due, and I have ventured a conjecture as to what this improvement may have been. If to my friends in the Gutenberg Gesellschaft I seem guilty of *lèse-majesté*, I would ask them to remember that after

all Schoeffer was a German as well as Gutenberg.

As I have joined myself with those who would transfer the prize for the 42-line Bible from Gutenberg to Fust and Schoeffer, it is only fair to say a word as to the evidence on which the Almanac recently discovered at Wiesbaden is assigned to 1448.¹

The fragment found contains the text for the first four months of the year, the lines being cropped at the ends. That for January reads (contractions expanded):

Off der heiligen drier Konnige dag zwo vren vor m[ittage] ist der mane nue. Vnd sint sonne vnd mane [in dem || xxv grade des steinbocks. Saturnus in dem xxvj [grade || des lewens vnd geet hindersich. Jupiter in den x [xij grade || der wagen. Mars in dem ersten grade des scorptions. Ve[nus in || dem xvij grade des wassergiessers vnd geet hindersich. Mer[curius || in dem iij. grade desselben zeichens. Off den xxj dag desselben m[andts || iij vren nach mittennacht ist der mane fol. Vnd ist die sonne [in den x || grade des wassergiessers. Der mane in dem x. grade des l[ewens || Saturnus in dem xxv grade des lewens vnd geet hindersich. [Jupiter || in dem xxij grade der wagen. Mars in dem xxv grade des scorptions || Venus in dem xj grade des waszergiessers vnd geet hindersich. [Mer || curius in dem xxvj grade desselbens zeichens.

The February paragraph begins:

Off den virdendag Februarii das ist of paffenfasznac[ht nun || vren nach mittage ist der mane nuwe.

The hour of the new moon being cut off, there is no evidence from this date. The other hours as-

¹ See Dr. Zedler's 'Die älteste Gutenbergtype.' (Mainz: Gutenberg-Gesellschaft, 1902.)

98 GUTENBERG, FUST, SCHOEFFER,

signed to the New and Full Moons are placed by Dr. Julius Bauschinger in juxtaposition with those for 1448 as follows:

Tables.				Fragment.			
H. M.				H.			
1448.	Jan.	6	10 16 a.m.	New	Jan.	6	10 a.m.
		21	4 30 a.m.	Full		21	3 a.m.
	Feb.	4	8 50 p.m.	New	Feb.	4	— p.m.
		19	10 59 p.m.	Full		19	10 p.m.
	March	5	6 40 a.m.	New	March	5	4 a.m.
		20	3 33 p.m.	Full		20	3 p.m.
	April	3	4 20 p.m.	New	April	3	4 p.m.
		19	4 45 a.m.	Full		19	6 a.m.

It is hardly possible that these dates should fit any other year equally closely, and astronomers have abundant other information as to the positions of Saturn, Jupiter, etc., from which to make calculations. If all these astronomical data only apply to the year 1448, it is difficult to see how the attribution of the Almanac to the end of 1447 can be disputed. It is pleasing to think that this brings us to within a year of the purchase in 1446 by Jean de Robert, Abbot of Saint Aubert, Cambrai, of the Doctrinale 'jeté en moule,' his entry of which in his accounts is a really solid argument for printing having been known at that date in the Netherlands. It brings us also within three years of the Avignon experiments of 1444. Six years earlier still Gutenberg had admitted the Heilmanns and Dritzehn to participation in the secret invention about which evidence could not be given without the use of the words, 'presse,' 'forme,' and 'trucken.' At present it looks as if Gutenberg were some years ahead of

AND INVENTION OF PRINTING. 99

his competitors in this contest in respect to documents, and a good many years ahead of them as regards the first extant piece of printing to which any definite date can be attached. But the last word is not yet said.

ALFRED W. POLLARD.

REVIEWS.

Papers of the Edinburgh Bibliographical Society, 1901-1904. Edinburgh. Printed for the Society, 1906. (Publications of the Edinburgh Bibliographical Society. Volume VI.) Pp. i-xxiv, 101-191.

THE appearance of a new volume, or part of a volume, of the Publications of the Edinburgh Bibliographical Society always denotes some solid additions to knowledge. It is only to be regretted that the additions are made at such long intervals. While other causes may contribute to this (we do not forget that Mr. Aldis's most useful 'List of Books printed in Scotland before 1700' was an interpolated issue), it can hardly be doubted that the smallness of the annual subscription is the main reason for the smallness of the output, and it is greatly to be regretted that a Society which has the opportunity and ability to do so much useful work should limit its normal operations to what can be effected on the insignificant income of £36 15s. a year. This continuation of the part of the sixth volume already published is mainly taken up with papers read before the Society in 1901 and 1903, so that it seems to have fallen nearly a volume behind. This is greatly to be regretted, as the 'abstracts of proceedings' for 1904-1906, show that several papers of great interest are (presumably)

waiting to be printed. Among these we notice an address by the late President, Mr. J. P. Edmond, whose loss all bibliographers deplore, containing suggestions on widening the scope and operations of the Society, and it is to be hoped that his suggestions may be carried out. To Mr. Edmond is also due one of the most interesting communications in the present volume, a very carefully compiled list of 'Elegies and other Tracts issued on the Death of Henry, Prince of Wales, 1612.' This contains no fewer than forty-four entries, all set forth with Mr. Edmond's unfailing accuracy, though marred by the occurrence of such forms as 'Nep-tvny Britannicvs,' according to the bad heresy of which he was one of the most distinguished supporters, that an upper case V must be transliterated in lower case by a v instead of (according to the old printers' own practice) by u.

Dr. T. G. Law, another distinguished member whose loss the Society has lately had to deplore, is represented by a short note on 'John Hamilton and the Scottis Bible,' in which he asks for information as to the alleged omission of some words ('they sal worship him in sacrifice and giftes') from an unidentified edition of the Bible for use in Scotland, perhaps one of the Genevan editions printed in Holland in 1599. Mr. William Stuart has a rather amusing paper about the Rae Press at Kirkbride and Dumfries, showing from a contemporary satire that while it was nominally managed by Robert Rae, the real owner was Peter Rae, a Scottish minister of some mechanical genius. The satire was written by Robert Ker in 1719 as part of 'A Glass wherein

Nobles, Priests and People may see the Lords' controversies against Britain,' and some of the lines against the Rev. Peter run:

Oh he's selling Souls for the love of Gear,
 No other Thing he can do here.
 His name is Mr. Peter Rae,
 I think he has gone far astray.
 Indeed, he's gone to seek a Man,
 To teach him when he does go wrong.
 The Printing Trade he does now try,
 The Minister's Trade he should lay by.
 Is this agreeable to his Station?
 No, he should not have that Occupation.
 What way will his poor Sheep be fed,
 When he is at the Printing Trade?

The last paper which we can notice is an important list of additions and corrections to the valuable bibliography of the Darien Company, by the late Mr. John Scott, printed in the first portion of the present volume. The supplement is edited by the Society's Secretary, Mr. G. P. Johnston, and increases the original list by sixty-four new books and documents.

The Printers, Stationers, and Bookbinders of Westminster and London from 1476 to 1535. By E. Gordon Duff. Cambridge at the University Press.

These two series of lectures delivered by Mr. Duff in 1899 and 1904 as Sandars Reader in Bibliography at the University of Cambridge form, for the sixty years which they cover, by far the best

history of printing and bookbinding in England yet written. Mr. Duff's knowledge of his subject is unrivalled, and the necessities of oral delivery have kept his narrative clear and even amusing. The book abounds with passages which no one else could have written. Here is one:

Looking at the very large number of small books which De Worde printed between the end of 1496 and 1500, it is surprising how many are known from single copies. I have kept for many years a register of all the copies of early English books which are to be found anywhere, and taking the quartos printed by W. de Worde, which number altogether 70, I find that out of that number 47, that is, more than two-thirds, are known to us now from single copies or fragments. And I feel certain that we owe the preservation of the majority of these to a cause we are now doing our best to destroy. A few worthy people centuries ago made collections of these tracts and bound them up in immensely strong volumes, which gave them an air of importance in themselves, and tended to preserve the tracts in a much better manner than if bound separately. I do not think I am exaggerating when I say that a hundred and fifty of the rarest that De Worde printed during his whole life would have been found a hundred years or so ago bound up in about twelve volumes. Some twenty-two of the rarest W. de Worde's in the Heber Library came to him in one volume. Thirteen unique tracts which sold at the Roxburghe Sale for £538 were in a single volume when the Duke purchased them fourteen years before for £26. I need only refer you to the University Library, a large number of whose unique Caxton and Wynkyn de Worde tracts came in three or four volumes. Then again, when so many are known only from fragments or single copies we may imagine what a large number have absolutely disappeared. . . .

Besides the genuine books which have disappeared, by

this I mean books which have been described by a trustworthy bibliographer, there are others which may reasonably be supposed to have existed, and one clue to these is afforded by the woodcuts. W. de Worde, for example, had certain series of cuts specially made for certain books; but when he wished to decorate the title-page of a small tract, which was not itself to be illustrated, he used an odd cut out of his sets. Now when we can trace in different tracts odd cuts manifestly belonging to a series, we may reasonably suppose that the book for which the series was engraved must have been printed.

To give a couple of instances. In the unique copy of Legrand's *Book of Good Manners* in the University Library without date, but printed about the middle of 1498, are two cuts, which really belong to a series made to illustrate the *Seven wise masters of Rome*. These cuts are fairly accurate copies of those used by Gerard Leeu in his edition of 1490. At a considerably later date De Worde did issue an edition of the *Seven wise masters*, illustrated with the series of which the two mentioned above formed part, and showing at that time marks of wear. Now as De Worde had the series cut by the beginning of 1498, I think it most probable that an edition of the book was then issued, for it is unlikely that he would go to the trouble of cutting the set unless he was preparing to print the book. Again, before the end of the fifteenth century De Worde had a series to illustrate *Reynard the Fox*. One cut is found on the first leaf of an edition of Lidgate's *The Horse, the Sheep, and the Goose*, in the University Library, another on the title-page of Skelton's *Bowge of Court* in the Advocates Library at Edinburgh. In the collection of the University Librarian is a fragment of an edition of Reynard, evidently printed by W. de Worde about 1515, and this contains a third cut agreeing absolutely in size, in workmanship and in style with the other two.

In this case, again, it seems probable that an edition illustrated with these cuts appeared before 1500.

Wynkyn de Worde's edition of Lydgate's 'The Horse, the Sheep, and the Goose' has just been published in facsimile, so that the Reynard wood-cut can now be seen without a visit to Cambridge. Mr. Jenkinson also mentions in his preface that it is one of twenty-five Wynkyn de Worde quartos, bound up with one of Pynson's, in a single volume from Bishop Moore's library, thereby illustrating an earlier point made by Mr. Duff in the passage we have quoted. The seventeen Tudor plays found last year when an Irish chimney-corner was unbricked, and which fetched such high prices at Sotheby's, are another instance of the preservative power of the fat quarto, though the fact that they are now known to be worth over a hundred pounds apiece will probably have an equally conservative effect. An important foreign instance, in which the occurrence of a single cut before the only extant edition of an illustrated work entitles us to assume the existence at one time of an earlier edition, is that of the *Quatiregio* of Frezzi, now known to us only from the edition of 1508, but of which Mr. Fairfax Murray assumes an issue in the fifteenth century precisely on this ground. Whether, as Mr. Duff seems inclined to think ('it would seem probable that the printer, when issuing a small book printed only a small number of books'), we can argue back from the fewness of the extant copies to the smallness of the original edition, may be gravely doubted. The larger the edition the cheaper the book, and the cheaper the book the more likely it is to be thumbed to pieces or left to perish.

Mr. Duff has some interesting notes as to the dates at which our early printers began their year, an important question in arranging chronologically books published between 1st January and 25th March. Caxton undoubtedly followed the year of the Incarnation, which begins on 25th March, and Mr. Duff proves that Julian Notary used the same reckoning, at least in the case of the edition of the 'Golden Legend,' to which he gave the date 16th February, 1503, adding the regnal year 19 Henry VII, which shows that the February he means fell in what we should call 1504. On the other hand, in Pynson's Morton Missal, the date 10th January, 1500, almost certainly means 1500 of our reckoning, since by January, 1501, Cardinal Morton was dead. So also the mention of the regnal year in Wynkyn de Worde's 'Golden Legend' of 8th January, 1498, and references to the Countess of Richmond and to Henry VII in the colophon to the Gospel of Nicodemus, dated 23rd March, 1509, prove that in both these books the present civil year was used. When we find Caxton using one reckoning, and his quondam foreman another, we can only hope tremblingly that each of them was consistent throughout his own books, though with the misdoings of some of the Venetian printers before us it is impossible to feel certain as to this.

Mr. Duff's book is full of excellent notes about bookbinding, and he raises more interesting points than we have space to enumerate. On the principle of *ex pede Herculem* the long passage which we have quoted is the best recommendation of his book that we can offer. There are dozens of passages

equally interesting, and we hope that they will win for the book the success which it deserves.

Book-Prices Current. A record of the prices at which books have been sold at auction from October, 1905, to July, 1906, being the season 1905-1906. Vol. XX. Elliot Stock.

'An exceptionally high price, due entirely to the quality of the binding,' is the beginning of Mr. Slater's note on a copy of 'Les amours pastorales de Daphnis et Chloé' in old french morocco by Derome, which by virtue of its jacket fetched £13. Yet, according to his wont, he gives no reference in his index either from Derome or under Bindings. In like manner, anyone who wants to know if any books printed by Pynson or Wynkyn de Worde were sold by auction last year, must read through the whole volume to get the information. This is the annual complaint which we have to make against Mr. Slater's work, and as we are weary of making it we put it in the front of our notice this year, and pass on to other matter without further emphasizing the gravity of his shortcomings in this respect. We are glad to note that the average price per lot last season (£2 11s. 3d.) is the lowest but two of the decade, the two cheaper years being 1900 (when few first-class books were sold) and 1904, in which the averages were £2 6s. 2d. and £2 9s. 3d. A good many little bubbles have been pricked since 1901, when the record average of £3 7s. 10d. was attained. Mrs. Frankau's 'Eighteenth Century

Colour Prints,' for instance, which used to fetch £17, was sold last season for £2 10s., and a Japanese vellum copy of Sir R. Holmes's 'Queen Victoria,' such as was dealt in before its issue at about £30, for a tenth of that sum. Anything which discourages petty gambling in books is a cause for rejoicing, and on this ground we refrain from indignation at the moderate prices now fetched by the Kelmscott books, fine though they are. The highest total realized at any sale during the season was the £8,505 attained at a miscellaneous sale of 930 lots at Sotheby's in December, 1905. The highest total at the sale of a private collection, the £4,052 realized by Sir Henry Irving's books at Christie's. No printed book during the year is recorded as having fetched more than £380, and this price was given for an extra-illustrated 'Life of Dickens,' the next competitors being a Latin Bible which had belonged to Ben Jonson (£320), Knox's 'Book of Common Order' in Gaelic (£305), and a Prayer-book of Charles I's (£285). Twenty-two other books fetched prices ranging from £130 to £235, but more than half of these belonged to the volume of seventeen Tudor plays already mentioned in our review of Mr. Duff's book. According to his praiseworthy habit of sometimes going a little out of his way to note an interesting sale not strictly within his scope, Mr. Slater notes that at the Tross sale at Vienna a block-book of the 'Apocalypsis' fetched £1,125, and a fine copy of the Fust and Schoeffer 'De Officiis' of 1465 no less than £1,875, both books being bought by Mr. Quaritch. There is thus clearly plenty of money in England, or England and

America combined, to secure real rarities of the first class when they come into the market. On the other hand, the fate of the buyer of poor copies is eloquently told by the figures as to the sale of a collection of incunabula sold at Christie's. In this case 685 lots, many of them containing several books, only realized about £800, showing an average price only about one half of the average of the whole year, and this though many of the books were by good printers. The moral of this volume of 'Book-Prices Current,' as of several of its predecessors, is obviously that while the prices fetched by the best books are higher than ever, for second-rate books there is no great increase of price, while for third and fourth-rate books the market tends to fall.

On the lines to which he chooses to confine himself Mr. Slater's book is executed in his usual workmanlike manner, and retains its character of being indispensable to those who want to be kept informed of what is going on in the world of old books.

The Bible in Wales. A study in the history of the Welsh people, with a bibliography. Henry Sotheran and Co.

The story of the printing of the Scriptures in Welsh is a very interesting one, though not particularly creditable to the English Privy Council, Bishops and Printers on whose pleasure the Welsh people had to wait. The first Welsh Bible was not published until 1588, over half-a-century after the

first English printed edition, an enactment twenty-five years earlier that the four Welsh bishops and the Bishop of Hereford should edit a translation having been apparently met by a policy of passive resistance, despite the fact that a date (1st March, 1566) was fixed on or before which copies were to be placed in all parish churches, under a penalty of forty pounds in case of failure to be levied on each of the said bishops. Down to the time of Oliver Cromwell's Protectorate no more than 3,500 copies of the Bible in Welsh had been circulated, and though the pace quickened after this, the King's printer, with whom the monopoly mainly rested (the University presses possibly could not, certainly did not, come to the rescue), seems to have had no belief in the commercial prospects of Welsh Bibles, and the wants of Wales were but meagrely supplied. How these difficulties were overcome is told briefly in an excellent address by Sir John Williams, delivered at the opening of the Exhibition of Welsh Bibles out of which the present work developed, and which it reprints. It is told at full length and with the aid of a full bibliography by Mr. John Ballinger, whose modesty in withholding his name from the title-page of his book is surely excessive. Both the bibliography and the introduction to it are excellent work, and Cardiff has one more reason to be proud of its librarian.

NOTES.



ALL readers of 'The Library' will be glad to hear that the omission from this number of the usual article by Miss Elizabeth Lee on 'Recent Foreign Literature' does not mean that this feature of the Magazine, which has been much appreciated, is to be discontinued. Miss Lee hopes to be able to contribute as usual to our April number.

Students of our earlier drama who desire to obtain trustworthy texts of rare plays and also of documents relating to the English stage, are invited to join the newly-formed Malone Society, of which Mr. E. K. Chambers, author of 'The Mediaeval Stage,' has been elected the first President, while Mr. W. W. Greg, author of the 'Lists of English Plays and Masques printed before 1642,' and also of a recently-published treatise on the Pastoral Drama, will act as General Editor. The method of reproduction adopted by the Society is that loosely known as 'type-facsimile,' in which the setting and typographical features of the original issue are imitated as closely as possible in modern founts, so that the reader has all the advantages of the old text with the addition of legibility, which in many instances the old texts certainly do not possess, and which it is almost impossible for photographic re-

production to attain unless largely touched-up by hand. To produce a 'type-facsimile' is no easy task, but as it has been taken as a rule that every page shall be read by at least two pairs of eyes besides those of the printer's reader, it is hoped that accuracy may be attained. Further information about the Society can be obtained from Mr. Arundell Esdaile of the British Museum. The annual subscription is One Guinea, and at present there is no entrance-fee.

y
y
y
-
t
n
-
al
is